2.5

Please Return To:

ROBERT J. BOSER

3430 So. Shoshone

Englewood, Colo.

THE CHALLENGE:

THE CHURCH AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

By

Frederick Lynch

The Challenge: The Church and the New World Order. 12mo, cloth, net $1.25

A forward look taken by a man who is regarded as a vigorous and liberal thinker. Dr. Lynch contends that, with the coming of peace, the Church will be faced with some tremendous and inevitable problems which she must meet with a new application of Christian principles. If she fails, the world will look elsewhere for solution and readjustment.

The New Opportunities of the Ministry. With Introduction by Hugh Black, M. A., D.D. 12mo, cloth . net 75c.

"A veritable book for the times and call to strong young men for the future. Dr. Lynch makes it clear that the very things which make the present work of the ministry look difficult, as compared with the past, are its especial warrant and glory."—*The Continent.*

The Peace Problem. The Task of the Twentieth Century. Introduction by Andrew Carnegie. . . . . net 75c.

Andrew Carnegie commends this book in no stinted terms. "I have read this book from beginning to end with interest and profit. I hope large editions will be circulated by our peace organizations among those we can interest in the noblest of all causes."

THE CHALLENGE:

THE CHURCH AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

BY

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D.

Author of " New Opportunities of the Ministry," "What Makes a Nation Great?" "The Last War," etc., etc.

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1916, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 N. Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond St., W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

DEDICATED TO

MRS. ANDREW CARNEGIE

whose Friendship is always an Inspiration to
High Endeavour and to the Service
of Humanity

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/challengechurchn00lync

PREFACE

THIS book has been published for two reasons. The first is that I might reach the younger clergy of the country and put before them the wonderful opportunity now facing the Christian Church. The second is that the only way to meet the many requests for some of the chapters of these books (all of which have been published singly) was to gather them into a book. Many of them have evoked much comment, some favourable, some adverse. But they have evidently stirred many to think upon the grave problems and opportunities now facing Christianity, especially as it is embodied in the Church.

The book is an attempt to apply the teachings of Jesus to the international problems now facing the nations. Such a cataclysm as this which the world is now witnessing must make all serious men pause and think. Especially for those who believe that Christianity is both possible and potent in the world, these are perplexing days. It is vain and dangerous to deny that the Church is on trial in any nation. One has only to read the papers, the books, and the letters that are being written in both Europe

and America to realize the serious questioning of the power of the Church to redeem the world, that is going on in the minds of many men. One cannot escape the fact that there are great heart-failings in both Europe and America, and in some countries a rather striking defection from the Church. A very dark cloud of pessimism, born out of discouragement and suffering, has settled down upon Europe. It has reacted upon America in the minds of those who think.

I believe however—because I believe in God—in evolution, and in the teachings of Jesus Christ, that the Church, which should be the voice of Christ in the world, has the power to redeem the world from that most deep-rooted of all curses, war. But it cannot do so unless it dare believe its own gospel, and dare to demand that the nations base their relationships upon those same Christian principles upon which the relationships of all Christian gentlemen are based. *There is absolutely no use of going back to the gospel the Church had for the nations before this war, and it is utterly futile to go back to the only bases upon which international relationships previously rested.* If the Church has no greater gospel, no higher message for the world than that now being offered by Security Leagues, Defense Societies, Army and Navy Leagues,

Patriotic Organizations, Conscription Leagues, and Preparedness Parades, then it might as well confess its impotency to be the leader of the world out of chaos into order. For none of these organizations are offering anything except the principles on which the old order rested, toppling always, insecure, and at last falling. It is this truth I wish to recall to the Churches. But mostly I wish to reassure those prophetic souls who have been writing me from all over our great land—and there are many, young, ardent, full of faith—that this is the great day of the Church if it but go forth with its Lord in a great venture far beyond the power of those who are bound by habit of thought and tradition, to go. To them belongs yesterday and to-day in Europe—to-morrow belongs to us.

All this material has been used in editorial form in *The Christian Work* during the past year. This accounts for some repetition and some informality of expression not generally expected in a book. But it seemed best not to re-write them, and print them practically unchanged. F. L.

NewYork.

CONTENTS

I.	The Church on Trial .	11
II.	Has the Church Lost the Power of Venture? .	24
III.	Shall We Abandon the Impossibles?	35
IV.	Militarism or Pacifism: Which Will Win? . .	47
V.	The Present Condition of Christianity in the Warring Nations . . .	64
VI.	The Task of the Twentieth Century . . .	78
VII.	A Nation's True Greatness	85
VIII.	"Choose This Day Whom Thou Wilt Serve" . .	93
IX.	The Present Issue . .	102
X.	Doctrine and Deed . .	110
XI.	The World's Incapacity to Learn	119
XII.	The League to Enforce Peace	132

XIII.	Why Not a League of the American Nations? .	140
XIV.	The World Court to Displace World War . .	147
XV.	The Best National Defence	160
XVI.	The Nation's Real Foes Within Its Own Borders	169
XVII.	The Leavings for Christ .	177
XVIII.	America and the Rehabilitation of Europe . .	185
XIX.	Man's Relationship to God	192
XX.	Man's Relationship to Man	199
XXI.	Man's Relationship to the World	207
XXII.	Man, the Builder . .	213
XXIII.	Two Philosophies of Life	221
XXIV.	The Need of the Gospel .	232
XXV.	What Does Christ Want Us to Do?	241
XXVI.	Jesus' Test of Discipleship	249
XXVII.	Some Rays of Hope . .	255

I

THE CHURCH ON TRIAL

NO one can read some of the books which are coming over from Europe without noting a growing sentiment among their authors that not much is to be expected from the Church in the way of constructive measures after this war is over. There are three books before us as we write. All three of them are having a very wide reading in England, and all three are by authors who not only are widely read, but who exert a very wide influence and have large followings. All three of these books, "What Is Coming?" by Herbert G. Wells; "What Is Christianity?" by Bernard Shaw, and "Christ and Peace," by a group of prominent young Englishmen —representative of the different universities— are attempts at forecasting the Europe that must come after this war. These men see that there must be a new order of things if Europe is not to be plunged into this thing again. And to be driven to this thing again

means the bottomless pit. All of these books are hopeful, too. They believe that many in Europe have at last been pretty thoroughly disillusioned as to the worth of war. They believe that a new generation will come along and demand both a new international ethic and a new international political order. They all quite unanimously say that this new ethic will be the ethic of Jesus. Mr. Shaw devotes his book to pleading for this ethic. He even goes so far as to say that had Jesus founded a state on His own teachings, we should have the Christian society where there would be no war.

But none of these men has any confidence that the Church will lead in the establishment of this new order. They look to socialism, to unions for democratic control, to groups of young college men, to the Fellowship of Reconciliation, even to the labour unions. They hardly mention the Church as a factor in establishing the new order based on Christ's law of love, good-will, forgiveness of the enemy, service and mission the chief end of life, forgetfulness of self in the salvation of the world, discipleship to Christ above patriotism. They rather go out of their way to imply that there is no need of looking to the

Church. They intimate that no one is so much afraid of her own gospel as she, herself; that if she began practising it to-morrow, she would lose most of her "respectable" adherents; that she has said nothing of any particular significance since the war opened, and there was no sign of her making any preparation to say anything; that after the war she would go on preaching "patriotism" as her greatest message before a world that would need Christ again almost in bodily presence to begin to resurrect it, so has it mutilated its soul; and would go on discussing trivial things—and most great things are trivial before this greater calamity—while scattered groups of prophetic souls would be trying to lead the world back to Christ—the real Christ, who has been lost by both the Church and the world.

So discouraged have certain eager souls become over the possibility of the Church leading the nations out of the present unchristian order, that, without formally severing connection with the Church, groups of young, ardent followers of Jesus, both in England and America, have come together in new Christian fellowships, that they may proclaim to the nations a new gospel commensurate to a new and changed world. Thus in England, a group of

Cambridge students, discouraged over the silence of the Church in this time of awful crisis, joined themselves together in a "Fellowship of Reconciliation," which now numbers over four thousand young men and women. (This movement has been quietly but rapidly spreading over the United States.) It is a rallying point of those who believe that the teachings of Jesus should be applied to international relationships as well as to personal, and its confessed aim is "the enthronement of love in social, national and international relationships." We mention it here simply as a sign of the times. Here are four thousand young men leaving the Church that they may urge the teachings of Jesus upon the world, and offer the nations a new rule of life after this war is over. It means, of course, that they do not have faith that the Church will do it. The Roman Catholics of the United States have recently been holding a week's conference in New York, and there was evidently not the slightest stirring in anybody's heart of a great opportunity for the Church to redeem the world from the awful calamity upon it, and the only expressions on this great theme that this great Catholic congress could rise to were one or two to the effect that mili-

tary training was good because it inculcated obedience to authority. The foremost educator in the nation has expressed himself as follows: "At this moment none of the Christian churches has had any influence to prevent the catastrophe which has overtaken Europe . . . so far as the advent of universal peace is concerned, one form of Christianity is as good as another—and all are helpless." Any one who has carefully followed magazine, book and paper during the last two years has seen this sentiment echoed daily. Here is one of the strongest of these statements, in the introduction to the book mentioned above: "Christ and Peace":

"While the Church hesitates, there are numbers outside her borders who have no doubt that the present situation reveals a failure on her part to understand her true function in society. Many of these are not bitter critics, but reverent and earnest seekers. They have looked for light and leading, and have turned away disappointed. It may be that some such will welcome in this volume what is at least a serious attempt to face and state the full meaning of the Christian demand in relation to war. From them, not less than from the members of organized Christian bodies, we have a right

to expect help in the supreme task that opens out before the race. Perhaps, by some such united effort, we may find our way to a truer conception of the Church, as well as to a mission more worthy of the high ideals which have been committed to her. What the writers of these papers desire is that the Church may take her rightful place when the war is over, and may at last proclaim a living message with prophetic power, a message which shall direct the minds of men to those great truths in obedience to which the health of the nations is to be found. What they fear is that she may lose her chance of proclaiming that message then, because now she has not spoken with the note of reality and conviction, and because she has not dared to face the full meaning of the problem involved in this war. If they can help toward avoiding this danger, and preparing for the new day—in however small a way—they will be rewarded for taking a course which they are well aware may cause misunderstanding at a time of crisis like the present."

While this doubt of the Church is certainly very widespread at just this time, there are on the other hand, millions who love her still and have faith, or, at least, have hope, that this great war will be the occasion of her rising to

a supreme height of leadership such as she has not exercised since apostolic days, and of declaring the whole gospel of Christ regardless of governments, powers and men. The trouble has been that she has been dwelling too much on the lesser things and neglecting the greater. And now she has seen civilization slipping out of her control. Will she see this? And will she attack the greater evils and preach commandingly the whole gospel of Christ? And will she now get down to realities? It is her testing time. She is on trial as never before. If she does not do it the world will turn elsewhere, for the good people of the world have made up their minds that they do not want this thing again.

As for us, we believe she will. Ten good men would have saved Sodom, and we believe the more than ten prophetic souls in the Church will save her. These prophetic souls within her bosom are increasing in numbers in spite of the thousands of her leaders who have as yet caught no vision. From every land, even from the pulpits of the belligerent nations, are coming voices in greater and greater numbers, saying, "Surely Christianity is great enough to save the nations, and the time has come at last to preach it in its fulness, to accept all its

implications, and to leave it to men either to accept it or reject it."

The world might reject it again, as it rejected it two thousand years ago. But, somehow, we believe it is at last ready to receive it. We believe that should Christ come again and repeat the Sermon on the Mount, men would say: "Yes this is the better way. We have called it foolishness and turned to our own ways of force and guns, and suspicions and revenges, and punishments, and doctrines of right and honour, and nationalism and security, and competition and self-aggrandizement—and it has all failed, utterly, absolutely, unqualifiedly failed. Now let us try Thy way. Perhaps after all Thou knowest better than we, O Christ, the eternal laws and the foundations of lasting happiness and strength." We said that we believed the world might listen. Yes, and we believe this so heartily that we believe the world will not long listen to the Church—His representative, His vicar, His appointed voice for Him in the earth—unless she speedily goes forth to say just this word.

The world is not much longer going to care much for a Church that is simply an echo of the world and the world order. What first sowed the seed of distrust of the Church in

Luther's mind was the fact that when he went to Rome he found the Church living just as the world did. What is sowing in many minds the seed of distrust of the Church's power to lead at this time is that they see her thinking just as the world does. It was pungently expressed last winter by a gentleman who was strolling up Fifth avenue, New York, one evening, when he saw a notice in front of a church to the effect that the pastor was to preach on "Preparedness." "I went in," he said, "expecting to hear a sermon on the text 'Prepare to meet thy God,' and instead I found the minister preaching on 'Prepare to meet the Germans.'" "What did you do?" he was asked. "I came out," he replied, "for when the Church becomes simply an echo of the Navy League—well, I'll take my New Testament and listen to Christ." Here, one has it all.

If the Church would rise to the great calling that awaits her, lest it pass into the hands of others, let her realize that she cannot save the world if she is to be only an echo of it, preaching only the gospel of the crowd, repeating the sentiment of the daily press, rising no higher than the resolutions of conservative chambers of congress, proclaiming the ethics of the market place, and in her councils passing

resolutions in face of the great world tragedy that rise no higher than those passed by defence societies.

Let her realize that she must preach a new patriotism, a patriotism that is not so much concerned with saving the nation as it is in having the nation be a Christ-nation to the other nations of the world. When Jesus Christ said: "I think not of myself, but only of how I can save my brothers," a dynamic was injected into the world that has made it new so far as human hearts are concerned. What another renewing force would be liberated in the world if the whole Church of Christ in America would say: "Let America be not tremblingly thinking of herself, but only how can she save the other nations?" Ah, what a glorious Church that would be, and how aghast the world would stand before it, as did the Romans and the Greeks before Christ!

Let her realize that if she is to be the world's accepted one, she must preach the new—it is as old as Christ—nationalism. The old nationalism has always been the root of war. It was the one deep-rooted cause of the present war. Many in Europe are beginning at last to distrust it, while in our own land our short-sighted politicians and our backward-looking

statesmen and our preparedness advocates are agitating it and using it as a slogan. If it is the only gospel the Church has then the outlook is truly evil. For how long will a disillusioned world, a world in doubts, misgivings over everything it has known, distrusting all the past orders since they have landed it only in hell, look to a Church that has no higher gospel than "America only," "Deutschland über Alles," "England forever?" But suppose the Church should rise and say: "Now for the kingdom of God; now for the republic of all good men; now for the fellowship of all believers; now for the communion of saints; and let every disciple of Jesus Christ count every other disciple nearer to him than any member of his own nation who is Christ's enemy; and let every Christian's allegiance be first to Jesus Christ; and let every Christian say that never will he kill his brother Christian in any land or nation at the behest of governments any sooner than he would kill his own child—for this brother is his Christ's little child and in killing him he makes Christ's and his heavenly Father's heart bleed." Would there ever be another war? There could not be. There need not be, if the whole Church would insist on obeying Christ first. We believe the very

boldness of the Church should it thus say again what its Lord said would draw all men to it in holy wonder.

Finally, let her realize that a great stream of testimony is coming out of Europe, from the trenches, from impoverished villages, from stricken homes, to the effect that militarism, armament, war itself is all sham, abomination, and futility. As was said rightly by a distinguished Englishman the other day, "The future pacifists of Europe are in the trenches." From all parts of Europe are coming echoes of a determination "To try some better way." From Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are coming plans for a permanent peace based on other things than guns. In Sweden, the mass meetings and acts of parliament calling for disarmament are but indices of what thousands are feeling in Europe. What a chance for the Church to rise in majesty and say, with its Lord of love and peace: "Let us put away these old things now and forever. Let us make a great venture. Let us make a great act of faith. Let us all forgive our enemies and start anew. Christ can make all things new. Let all who call themselves Christians get together, as men and States have got together, and form a compact, or a league of nations,

or some sort of united nations of the world, and lay down our arms, using courts in their stead, and let us learn to love and help one another, as children of the same Father, and walk arm in arm together through a world that calls for our united, spiritual warfare against many evils; and let us remember that before us all lies one destiny, one home. We must live together then. Let us learn to live together here." Can the Church rise to say that soon? If she cannot, others will. Is it not significant that already the great novelist, Romain Rolland, a Frenchman, has just said it in his wonderful letter, "Above the Battle"? It is an echo of Christ—but why is not the Church unitedly saying the same thing?

II

HAS THE CHURCH LOST THE POWER OF VENTURE?

THE creation of the Christian Church was a great venture. It was an act of sublime and surpassing faith. A young man was born into an age of convention, religious formalism and theological fixity. He dreamed a dream of a new kingdom—a kingdom of freedom and of the spirit. He conceived a state to be founded on good-will. He called together twelve men—it was the greatest venture ever made—and established a Church which was as far removed from the existing Church as socialism is from feudalism. It was its daring that saved it. The Church would not have lived had it been only a little way removed from the Jewish Church, only one step beyond or above. It was because it was so revolutionary, so radical, so impossible, that it lived and attracted the attention of the world. It arrested men. It put a new, glorious, alluring ideal, a living, spiritual state, an opportunity fit for gods before men. As a

result, it won prophetic souls, and these prophetic souls banded themselves together, held by the inspiration of a great venture and by devotion to their Lord—the great adventurer of history.

The primitive Church was a weak affair. When Christ died, there were probably not more than a hundred real members in existence. It was a little group of men and women, none powerful, none famous, set in the midst of a great Jewish religion and a Roman civilization. The first discussion which agitated this new Church was whether it should not conform to the Jewish faith, merely grafting on to it a faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Everybody knows now, that had the counsel of the conservative Jewish members prevailed, there would have been no Christian Church. Fortunately they did not prevail. The prophetic members had their way. The primitive Church decided to make a great venture. It broke with Judaism in one great bound. It broke with contemporary ethics. It broke absolutely with Roman civilization. It broke with the current Greek philosophy, which, at its core, was simply that life existed for self-protection, self-development, self-security. To see how great this break was, one has only to read the ser-

mons of the first missionaries as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul and John, and the sermons and treatises of the Church Fathers. The gospel offered by the early Church was as far removed from the ordinary conventional religion as were the stars from the haunts of men. It had nothing in common with the ideals or ethics of the crowd. Its idols had nothing in common with the idols of the market place. In a world that believed in revenge, it preached love. To a society engrossed in pleasure, it preached duty and purity. To a civilization based on force, it preached good-will. To a civilization in which war was the accepted and normal life, it made direct protest against war. (Practically every one of the Church Fathers say, "Christians must not bear arms against each other.") [1]

In a social order where caste was fixed and accepted, it said all men were equal. In an autocracy, it preached democracy. In a world that put nationalism above everything else, it placed humanity first, and put citizenship in the kingdom above allegiance to the State. In

[1] See Mr. Carnegie's exhaustive tabulation of the opinions of the early Fathers in his pamphlet "A League of Peace."

a world which idolized forcefulness, physical prowess, lordship over others, triumph in arms, it proclaimed meekness, gentleness, forbearance, and the spirit of lowly service as the most admirable qualities of manhood. With a sublime and unequalled confidence in its message it went out into the world with that message. It was a great venture and because it was a great venture the Church soon commanded the attention of the Greek and Roman world. It was the very impossible of the early Church that assured its life and growth. It not only drew the prophetic souls of the ancient world into its fold, but it commanded the admiration of the crowd in due time simply because it had a message. A Church without a message would never have made any progress in either Greece or Rome. But the great thing is that it dared make the great venture. By its very flight toward the stars it made itself seen of all men. Only that which is lifted up can draw men to it. The Church can lead only when it is far ahead of the people—only when it dares make the great venture.

Many are wondering to-day if the Church has lost this power of venture? Does it dare make the venture with Peter across the stormy sea to meet the Lord where He stands? One

has only even carelessly to read the secular press of both Europe and America, together with the many books that are being written, to see how widespread the feeling is that the Church, as an institution, has neither any vision in this moment of a crumbling world, nor any faith to make again the great venture, even if she had the vision. One turns in vain to the utterance of either Catholic or Protestant Church in Europe for any prophetic word. The Vatican has no great word for stricken Europe; the churches of Germany and Great Britain, after two years of war, have no new word to say. There is yet no intimation that they are planning any great venture after this war is over, formulating any new, prophetic word to speak to a world victimized by an unnecessary and diabolic war. Perhaps there is some excuse for the Church in Europe. It is sorely vexed at this time. It has its hands and heart absorbed in a work of immediate ministry. Its resources are heavily taxed and it is too hard pressed to find time for prayer or to exercise vision.

But what shall we say of the Church in the United States? What is happening in this favoured land, where, far from the scenes of war, we can contemplate it in right perspective,

view all its terrible calamity, study causes and effects, and speak some great healing, new word? Here is the greatest apostasy the world has ever witnessed. Here is a denial of everything for which Christ stood such as the darkest times of the Middle Ages never saw. Here are millions of Christians bending all their energies, resources and genius to slaughtering each other, stopping at no diabolical method. Here are millions of women and little children being starved and driven crazy, so that some nations—Poland, for instance—have been absolutely decimated of children. Here are fearful burdens being placed upon the shoulders of the poor for succeeding centuries. Here are institutions, social organizations, charities, philanthropies that have taken years to form, being all put aside for years. Here are missions set back for a century. Here are cities being devastated. But worst of all, here are hatreds among Christians being engendered that must make even the far-seeing Christ despair of His kingdom of good-will ever coming in the earth.

Now, whatever one may say about Christianity having not failed, because it has not been tried—and it has not, neither has it been preached—it is absolutely certain: that

the Church was not able to stem the awful flood of sudden passion that broke loose into war; hardly raised its voice in protest; was soon swept away by the mob in every country, and has since become nothing but the champion of the arms in each land. Neither, with the splendid exception of a few men and congregations in Great Britain and Germany, has the Church done or said anything in the last century that could make this present holocaust impossible or even improbable. There is no utterance of any ecclesiastical council, Protestant or Catholic, in Europe during the last one hundred years that has anything of the nature of venture in it or speaks out, as Christ would speak, against the blasphemy and sin of war, even of wars of conquest or for settling disputes, taking for granted now that one might have the right to repel direct invasion. When, two years before this war broke out, certain prophetic Swiss pastors drew up a really Christian protest against war—one which was praised by all prophetic souls, by poets and authors, as lofty, dignified, and really Christian—and asked the churches of Europe to consider it in conference together, they received —and they were very eminent men—not only the rebuff of the churches refusing to come to-

gether to consider it, but intimations, especially from Germany, that the churches could not discuss such subjects as the passing of war! That conference, with the official endorsement of the churches, might have prevented this war. But the Church had lost the power of venture. It *never can prevent* such deluges as the world is enduring, by anything it has yet said or done. Everybody must have been convinced of this.

We were saying that surely the Church in America, being uninvolved in the awful strife, and seeing the absolute failure of the Church, and the absolute inadequacy of anything the Church has yet said or done to prevent this awful daily crucifixion of the Lord, would rise at last to make another great venture, have some new word to say, at least be urged to say for once what its Lord Himself said, do some wonderful, compelling thing! But alas, alas, no word has come and we have the spectacle, with many noble exceptions, of the ministers in Christ's Church in America, with the great world crisis, calling for new utterances as great as those of Jesus, Paul, Luther or Wesley to meet great opportunities, writing letters to Washington asking for more guns; signing calls to arms in newspapers; marching in military parades among rows of glistening

bayonets; preaching "musket" patriotism; attacking pacifists who are trying simply to apply the principles of Jesus to international affairs. *This* the only word a large section of the Church has got to say to the world in this awful crisis—this, which is the same old word that Germany and England and France have been saying for a hundred years—"We must arm"; "self-defence"; "military preparedness"—this the only word in the great crisis of the world; this the only word, when it is the same word that has failed, as absolutely as Mohammedanism has failed, to build a lasting kingdom of good-will and love.

Has the Church lost the power of venture? What an opportunity for the Church in America to take a great venture and say the big, new, healing word; to condemn forever with one great unanimous voice the whole outworn, incapable, toppled, unchristian military and political systems that preceded this war; to proclaim the new gospel of love of the enemy, good-will, forgiveness, redemption of other peoples as the only mission of a nation as the primitive Church took a great venture and proclaimed it as the only mission of a Christian man; to proclaim that the time has come for the nation to bend all its energies to

establishing a kingdom of good-will among nations as the early Church proclaimed this as the mission of every soul; to demand that the nation's patriotism be to humanity as the individual's was to the kingdom; to demand that national boundaries shall mean no more to nations than local boundaries mean to Christians; to reaffirm Jesus' great teaching of real brotherhood, that membership in His kingdom constituted a closer tie than citizenship in the same country; to proclaim that the time has come for nations to rely on moral forces as much as do Christian men; to proclaim that the old ethic, the old political system, the whole old order of competitive armament has broken down and has no place in the Kingdom of God, and that the time has come for the Church to take Jesus by the arm and have *faith* in His teachings, and go forth bravely to apply them to the world.

We might as well frankly face the fact that there is no hope for the world until the Church rises to this. But has it got any power of venture left in it? Or is it to be, what it has been for centuries, simply the echo of the opinion of that crowd firmly entrenched in the toryism which sees no sense or security except in old things and old institutions? We

do not know. Certainly it is showing no signs of it yet. Perhaps the Church must pass, and let some new organization of the young, prophetic and venturesome, make the great venture. But we pray that the Church may rise to it.

III

SHALL WE ABANDON THE IMPOSSIBLES?

THE Sermon on the Mount, as do most of the other teachings of Jesus, borders on the verge of the impossible. Indeed the Sermon on the Mount has been called "Christ's Impossibles" more than once. The Christian Church has recognized this in all ages—recognized that it was hard "to be perfect," "to love the enemy," "to forgive those who trespass against us," "to return good for evil," "to take no anxious thought of self," "to worry not over the things of this world," to believe "that our Heavenly Father feedeth us, clotheth us, protecteth us," "to lose one's own life in the service of others," "to resist evil by love rather than by force." We say the Christian Church has always recognized that the words of Jesus verged on the impossible, that the sayings were hard. *But never until this year has a disposition manifested*

itself among Christians, even among ministers, to set aside the words of Jesus as too high for human needs, too impossible to be useful, too far removed from possibility of human attainment, too remote to guide us in times of stress, too idealistic for a practical world, too unworkable to be trusted and therefore to be set aside, for the time being, and the ideals of the Old Testament substituted for them, or even more human, more primitive motives than those of the Old Testament.

To be sure, suggestions to this effect have come from outside Christianity. We remember one of the great Hindu writers remarking that Christianity was too beautiful *to work.* He would keep the New Testament in the libraries, he said, along with the other Utopian schemes of history—this one most Utopian of all—then he would put the Ten Commandments into the hands of the people as the highest ideal, and expect nothing but approximation to these. We remember his naïve remark, that "when you found a man who loved his enemy, you could be sure he had strayed from heaven or was about to go there." Many of our readers will remember that the eminent Chinese Ambassador to this country of a decade or so ago, speaking in

New York, remarked that Confucianism with the Golden Rule as the light of its ethics,—it will be remembered that Confucius gave the Golden Rule as the summary of religion, putting it in negative form—was much more likely to become the world religion than Christianity with "its impossibles." Christianity was too impracticable, too idealistic, a religion for perfect men, for heaven, not earth, he said. He went further, and said it was discouraging because it set the standard too far off. It was too high. He drew his conclusions, he said, from watching Christians. And none with whom he talked, with one or two exceptions, ever seemed to be trying to live by Christ's teachings or trying to reproduce his real life in the world. He even intimated that any government which might attempt to go over on to a Sermon on the Mount basis tomorrow would have to go out of business at once.

In 1903 a little volume was published by McClure, Phillips and Company entitled, "Letters from a Chinese Official: An Eastern View of Western Civilization." Curiously enough it gives utterance to the same thoughts Li Hung Chang spoke, and almost in the same language. He observes: "I cannot see that

your society is based upon religion at all; nor does that surprise me, if I have rightly apprehended the character of Christianity. For the ideal which I seem to find enshrined in your gospels and embodied in the discussions of your divines, is one not of labour on earth, but of contemplation in heaven; not of the unity of the human race, but of the communion of saints." A distinguished Mohammedan has made the same criticism of Christianity—its ideals too high, its demands too great. And even the Jewish rabbis have criticized it on the same ground.

But never, until this year, have Christians themselves showed any marked disposition to acquiesce in these accusations, and exclaim with the enemy: "These are hard sayings; we cannot hear them." The Church has clung to them in spite of every discouragement, in spite of attack of enemy and sceptic, in spite of the criticism of those who find prudence the highest form of excellence, in spite of the scorn of the worldly and the sinner, in spite of the fact that the ideal is still far off. For she has seen that a religion to be of any service must be one in which aspiration is forever the chief and commanding characteristic. As Brierley once said, "Its call must be to the infinite

within him, and the morality it offers must partake of that infinitude." The moment religion is not an aspiration, but is an easy fulfilment, that moment men abandon it as a religion. Religion is a striving rather than an easy attainment. And it has been just this putting of an immediate impossible moral imperative before the world that has kept the Church alive through two thousand years—years that have seen other religions rise and fall. It has been its great appeal and its power. If history teaches one oustanding truth, it is this: "Because Christianity in its ethic opens this moral *infinite* it has been the inspiration of the world."

The Church has also recognized that to get man's mind off the commonplace and to lift it out of the level of animal passion and selfishness, an inspiration, an offer, an ideal, a standard infinitely above where perhaps it can immediately rise, is necessary. We have to hitch humanity to a star even to pull it out of the ditch, and set it on the level, or on a little hill. And the world has been lifted by slow stages, little by little, because of this great ideal. *Wherever there has been any moral progress, it has been where this ideal was never lowered.* It was just those ages

when the Church was tempted to lower it a little, that we call "the dark ages."

Furthermore, the Church has recognized that some men since Jesus have approximated, through the grace of God and the power of Christ, this very command of perfectness. She has had her John, Paul, Augustine, Francis, Elizabeth, à Kempis, Elizabeth Fry, John Fox, Drummond, Whittier, Phillips Brooks, and many more who came near enough to this ideal to make her believe that these impossibles are possible for man, when he will take his own gospel seriously and have faith in it. And in spite of all the evil of the world, the Church has had courage to believe Christ, and that while these heights might, at present, be unscalable, He intended that men should some time live on them as their home. She would not let the scientist have more faith in her Lord than has she herself. For John Fiske, predicting the time when the altruism of the Sermon on the Mount should have become the normal social principle, and referring to the fact that Christ's doctrine was a foresight of the moral world process and its result, asks, in the light of evolution: "When have we ever before held such a clue to the meaning of Christ as in the Sermon on the Mount?

'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.' In the cruel strife of centuries has it not often seemed as if the earth were to be rather the prize of the hardest heart and the strongest fist? To many men these words of Christ have been as foolishness and as a stumbling block, and the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount have been openly derided as too good for this world. . . . Man is slowly passing from a primitive social state in which he was little better than a brute towards an ultimate social state in which his character shall have become so transformed that nothing of the brute can be detected in it."

So the Church has stood firm for the New Testament ideal. Never insisting that men should live up to it, never expecting too much of humanity—perhaps never expecting quite enough—never quite daring to believe her own gospel, never preaching Christ's ideal in its entirety or with great courage, yet she has never, and so far as we remember, none of her leaders have, until this year openly *denied* them as the guiding principles of Christianity or hinted that they do not apply to the world of strong and living men. To our mind it is the most ominous thing the war has brought forth. And, worst of all, it is manifesting it-

self in America. One might expect the half frantic leaders of the German and English churches to desert the Sermon on the Mount, but it is ominous when America, supposedly still in her senses, should do so. Americans were shocked when, a year ago, some German theological professors began praising Mohammedanism and pointing out its close affiliation with Christianity, for the one thing of which there is not a vestige in Mohammedanism is the forgiving, merciful, loving spirit of the teachings of Jesus. We were shocked when, last summer, we heard German clergymen arguing that nations should not be bound by Christian ethics, indeed could not be. We were shocked at the preaching of hatred as a "holy thing" by certain German clergymen. We were shocked when that same hatred was preached from some English pulpits. We were shocked when some English Christians urged horrible reprisals against Germany after the Zeppelin raids. We were shocked when one of the most famous of English preachers pictured Christ with a bayonet charging against the foe. But now, in our own land, something of the same spirit is suddenly beginning to manifest itself, and Christian leaders, even clergymen, carried away by the war fever, are

beginning to preach sentiments utterly at variance with the words of Jesus.

We are not indulging in generalities. We have been making a careful study of many utterances by Christian pastors and laymen, called forth by the discussion on "preparedness" and President Wilson's course toward Mexico and toward Germany. To take one or two examples: A well-known doctor of divinity, editor of a great paper, devotes one of his leading editorials to prove that Jesus was an apostle of force, and in the course of it occurs this sentence: "John portrays Jesus as going forth as a conqueror on horseback in righteousness to make war!" What becomes of the Sermon on the Mount in the face of such an editorial? A militant clergyman on the Pacific coast has been justifying war out of the Bible. It is needless to say that he used the Old Testament. The justifiers of slavery used the Bible, it will be remembered. In a recent speech, one of those who is urging that this nation arm to the teeth, contemptuously referred to the "other cheekers." (It will be remembered that the words are Christ's.) If one should take the book just published by the leading advocate of force, in this nation, and print it in parallel columns

with the Sermon on the Mount, he would immediately see that they contradicted each other in every sentence. Recently a distinguished clergyman, in a company of ministers, raised the question whether the United States might not lead off, as the first nation to undertake such a high, Christlike task, and practise the Sermon on the Mount toward other nations, and he was almost *violently* opposed by large numbers of the clergy present. Many of these sermons openly advocate that the *chief* duty of a nation is to protect itself. (Jesus said, *in every instance,* without *any* exception that the chief duty in life was *service* to others.) A man came forth from church the other day remarking that the sentence which lingered longest in his mind, out of a militant sermon, was this: "We ought to be prepared to lick any nation on the earth." The lesson that day may have contained these words, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies." But no, any one who suggests that the United States act toward other nations as Christ asked us to act toward our neighbours, act as Christian gentlemen act, is called a "pacifist" and derided. But remember, when you deride the

pacifists, you deride the author of the Sermon on the Mount, for that is their creed. In a recent debate on preparedness in New York a well-known clergyman so held up the *principles* of the Sermon on the Mount to ridicule (without, of course, naming that fundamental pronouncement of the Lord) that an eminent citizen remarked the next day: "I believe in preparedness in a slight degree above that obtaining in this country. But I must confess that that gentleman's remarks struck me as disagreeable, coming from a clergyman."

We could multiply instances, but will quote but one more, one which shows just where this whole tendency to distrust the teachings of Jesus,—love, good-will, mercy, character, what we *are* rather than what we can *do*—as the best defence of a nation, and to put our trust in force and go forth to slay, logically ends. It is a quotation from a journal edited by Christians, "The Seven Seas," the organ of the Navy League: "It is absolutely right for a nation to live its fullest intensity, to expand, to found colonies, to get richer and richer by any proper means, *such as armed conquests.*" An apology for Germany? Oh no, for *us.* For the next sentence reads: "In the case of the United States, this is a particular duty."

If we need more "preparedness" all right. It is a question for experts to determine. But in the eagerness of good church members and some clergymen to get it are they really ready to throw over the Sermon on the Mount and other words of Jesus as the ethic of society? God help the Church and the nation, too, if as a Church she should do this. For the day we leave Christ as our Lord and put Force in his place we shall be—well, we may be where Europe is; but, anyhow, we shall sink back to those who follow the easily attainable. And, so far, in the history of the world, these have never risen above their own base instincts.

IV

MILITARISM OR PACIFISM: WHICH WILL WIN?

THE militarist is one who believes that his nation should go on making preparation to settle disputes with other nations by the old methods of arms and force.

The pacifist is one who believes that his nation, while supplying reasonable armament for policing land and sea, should be making preparation to settle disputes with other nations by the new methods of judicial procedure, leagues of nations, world courts, and councils of conciliation.

The militarist looks to the past and trusts to the old methods.

The pacifist looks to the future and trusts to the new.

The militarist, as a general thing, quotes the Old Testament.

The pacifist uses the New Testament almost exclusively, and finds basis for his gospel, that nations should live by the same principles as

those by which decent individuals live, in almost every word of Christ.

There has been an age-long strife between militarism and pacifism since the first great Pacifist, Jesus, enunciated His gospel of goodwill among men; the brotherhood of man, the forgiveness of the enemy; love, the test of perfection; the saving of the enemy a higher victory than killing him; *mission* the doctrine of life rather than rights. This, which is the creed of the pacifist, fell into a world where militarism only was triumphant. Curiously enough it made a good many converts, even in the midst of that world, saturated with militarism, and with no law but force. The early Christians would not bear arms, and practically every one of the Church Fathers record this fact. But militarism soon got the control of the Church, and it *has controlled it, as a whole, ever since.* Here has been its great apostasy, and not in the realm of theology.

But there have always been enough prophetic men in the Church to keep pacifism alive. Erasmus spent his life studying the New Testament, and he was driven to the conclusion that the settlement of disputes between nations by war was contrary to the whole word of Christ. He said it was "the method of cats."

Grotius studied the gospels and became convinced that they were opposed to war and he, the first great constructive pacifist, suggested a world court. Emanuel Kant, the first pacifist among philosophers, wrote his great Christian tract "Eternal Peace," in which he insisted that courts must supplant war, federations of nations supplant selfish individualism, treaties supplant guns, democracy supplant dynasties.

Ever since the days of Erasmus, each generation has had a witness for the Christian doctrine of justice and good-will as the law of international relationships. There is not time to mention them here, except those of our own land. For the strife between militarism, that is, the doctrine of armament, and pacifism, that is, the doctrine of judicial methods, conciliation and good-will, has suddenly reached an acute stage in our own land. Early in our history, pacifism, the Christian method, had its noble advocates. They did not represent the Church as a whole, for, until within the last twenty-five years the Church in America has stood for militarism as it has in Germany and Great Britain. But they represented the Christian teaching and the doctrine of the early Church on this point. They are a noble list. To mention only a few of the dead:

there were Ladd, Burritt, Sumner, Whittier, Garrison, Channing, Dodge, Worcester, Cuyler, Justice Brewer, Edward Everett Hale, Brooks, Robert Treat Paine, Josiah Strong and Smiley. The living number many more. They have made a brave fight and have gradually seen their efforts bear fruit, and have won many converts to their cause. They played a large part in bringing the nations together in Hague conferences; they have secured wide international organization; they were largely responsible for the securing of arbitration treaties, and they have successfully resisted all attempts to militarize the nation.

Then came the European war with all its horrors. The acts of some of the belligerent nations and the disposition manifested induced a semi-hysterical state in large bodies of the people which the militarists were quick to put to advantage. They entered upon a campaign for vast armament with all the energies and means at their disposal. All kinds of defence leagues were organized and the word "preparedness" chosen as a slogan. The leaders are the same men who have been behind the movement for the last ten years. They have become alert to the opportunity. As one of them remarked: "If we don't put our pro-

gram over now, we never can." They have carried many sincere people with them, but one who has studied the movement for years knows that it is the same group who ten years ago were trying to force upon Congress just the same program they are urging now—four battleships a year, a standing army of 500,000 men, payment of the State militia and National Guard, military training in the public schools. The only thing they have added is the demand they are making now for universal military training.

Up to this time the pacifist movement has been able to progress with little opposition. The only opposition came from men like Mr. Roosevelt and the militarist group, who, with him, opposed the passing of the Taft arbitration treaties wherein the United States agreed to settle disputes with Great Britain and with France by arbitration. But the war had not long been in progress before the contagion of militarism, fanned and whipped up by the leaders of the militarist movement, who saw their chance, seized upon certain classes of people. And now the fight is on between the militarists and the pacifists in our country in dead earnest.

The pacifist element is no smaller nor

weaker than it was. Indeed, it is much larger and much stronger than ever. It is doubtful if there were ever one one-hundredth as many people in this country who hated war and all preparation for it as there are now. It is simply that those who believe in the old way of war as over against the new way of judicial processes have been urged into action. Vast sums have been spent, popular catchwords, such as patriotism, nationalism, and Americanism, have been played upon, and misrepresentations of the pacifist movement spread far and wide. Any man who, to-day, dares utter a word in favour of even a constructive peace program is immediately held up before the people by the preparedness leaders as unpatriotic, un-American, and as lacking in heroism and courage.

The fight is on, and less and less is there any middle ground. Everybody can see that during the last few months the men who are leading the preparedness movement are dropping the word anti-preparedness, and using the simple term "peace people" or "pacifists" when they refer to those who do not favour the United States following the old and European ideals. It is also noticeable, on the other hand, how the press is referring to the advocates

of armament not as preparedness people, but as "militarists." It is patent to the most casual reader that the great dailies are more and more using the word *military* in place of the word *preparedness*. Thus the country is rapidly falling into two groups: those who on the one hand advocate *military* preparedness, the old, European, Napoleonic, Prussian ideal; and those who advocate *judicial* preparedness, the new, Christian, twentieth century ideal.

Which will win? We believe the new will win, because we believe that the ultimate victories are always with the *forward*-looking men, not with the backward. It may seem, for a moment, that the old is winning. But it must be remembered that the "preparedness" movement is the most highly engineered movement of modern times. It has back of it military forces, salaried men, some of the best press agents, and large sums of money. Its promoters rest not night nor day. They go from one city to another organizing meetings and parades. The peace advocates have neither money nor organization. It must also be remembered that every step toward preparedness means millions of dollars for munition manufacturers, battleship builders,

makers of guns wherewith to arm our new soldiers, clothing trades—many more. But in spite of all the immediate money gain—the greatest appeal to most men—we believe the idealists, the pacifists, those who wish to see America the moral leader of the world, the protagonists of the new order, will win, because they are forward-looking men, and because the ideal always triumphs in the end.

There are some encouraging signs right now. When the Union against Militarism saw President Wilson, Miss Wald asked him if there was not an attempt being made to stampede this nation into militarism. He seemingly took it for granted that there was, and answered: "But it is not working." In spite of everything it is not working. Congress is, evidently, going to be satisfied with an army of 200,000—a mere fraction of what the militarists want. All the "preparedness" organizations and their newspapers are frantic over it. Mr. Henry A. Wise Wood, one of the chief leaders of the militarist group, said on May 15, 1916, "the Army bill is only a makeshift and is wholly inadequate," and on May 18 came out with a long declaration for Colonel Roosevelt for President, as "the only

hope of the nation," that is, the only hope for universal conscription and the Germanizing of the people. The editorials of the "New York Times" and the "New York Tribune" admit that the movement for the great army is lost and are now turning toward a big navy. Mr. Roosevelt said, under date of April 26: "Twenty-one months have passed since the great war began, and during all this time we have not prepared in even the smallest degree in order, if possible, to avert war from us."

There are more battleships to be built this year than last; but the peace sentiment of the nation was so strong that it insisted that a rider be added to the Naval Appropriation Act which declares "the policy of the United States to settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration" and authorizes the President to call a conference of the nations to consider a World Court and general disarmament and if action leading in this direction is taken, to suspend construction of battleships called for by this act.

The Ford votes were interesting. They were no joke. They have opened the eyes of both Republicans and Democrats. They influenced the planks of both parties. The militarist movement is largely local and largely

tory. It is a local and caste movement. The workers, the farmers, the industrial classes take no interest in it. Neither is the Great West much concerned over it. C. M. Sheldon, author of "In His Steps," writing from Omaha, says the sentiment is strongly the other way, and calls attention to the resolutions passed at the great mass meetings in that section. The votes for Mr. Ford were protests against it.

But, by far, the most encouraging thing to those who are working for the substitution of good-will for war, judicial processes for battleships, the new order for the mediæval, is the frank confession made by Mr. Roosevelt in his last public utterance, his famous letter of April 24, in which he pledges all his family to go to war with Germany and in which in an unwise moment his indignation at those who are working for the new internationalism gets the better of his wisdom and he bursts out with this remarkable confession, "The pacifists and anti-preparedness people have had their will, and our rulers at Washington have bowed to them and left us helpless." This is high testimony coming from such source. It claims more than the peace people have even dared claim.

We must not let the even seeming victories

of the militarists disturb us too much. They have wars and rumours of wars, hysteria and fears to help them. The war will close soon. Our people will then calmly review it and see that the cause of this misery was just this militarism "preparedness" groups are advocating. They will hear from Europe a call for a new order, for Europe is getting fearfully wearied of just this thing the reactionary groups are advocating. Our people will see this and will turn from these reactionaries to follow the prophetic and forward-looking men of both Europe and America in the endeavour for the new preparedness of World Courts, Leagues of Nations, Alliances of the Churches of the World for Good-will, Unions for Democratic Control, Councils of Conciliation, Hague Conferences—all of those things for which the pacifists stand and for which they are contending while the militarists are parading for the old things—the things that will pass away. "Old things are passed away: behold I make all things new."

One closing word: Recently we received a letter in which this line occurred: "Is it not discouraging to see a hundred ministers parading for guns and shrapnel as the basis of the civilization of their Prince of Peace? Can

they be sincere? Do they endorse the utterances of the men and societies which got up that parade, such as an army of a million, all our boys taught to shoot, i.e., to kill their brothers of other lands, universal conscription, and the utterance of the Navy League's paper that the Government should take new territory by force as it needs it—the creed we have been condemning in Germany?" In answer let us say, we believe these men sincere, and we do not think that all of them would endorse the whole platforms of the militarist groups. It must be remembered that the ministry is no exception to other professions. There are always in it those who follow the crowd, who are easily stampeded, who are always looking backward, who lack the prophet's vision, who rest in the old and are distrustful of the new. It has been in every movement, from the anti-slavery movement down, that many ministers were on the side of the old and passing order. Some one remarked to us, the day after the one hundred ministers paraded in what the "New York Times" called "The Military Parade": "The ministers were there, but not the ministers the young men of America are following, not the leaders in the new social gospel, not the leaders in the new inter-

nationalism that is rising on the world." We offer no comment, but it is significant that the ministers in the parade were just the ministers who did not come to Garden City to take part in the World Alliance Conference called to enlist the churches of this nation in an attempt to substitute good-will in international relationships for suspicions and jealousies, and to see what the churches could do to help the world find some better way than war for the settlement of international disputes.

In this connection we would quote the following words from Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York: "We are on the threshold of a new age. Some nation must lead. That nation ought to be the United States. If the United States is to lead, then Christian men must show the way. If Christian men are to show the way, then the Christian pulpit ought to sound the note of advance. It is useless to expect the whole world to advance with all the nations abreast. One nation must move ahead of the others. It is foolish to expect all branches of the Christian Church to advance shoulder to shoulder. One branch must be ahead of the others. It is unreasonable to expect all the

ministers to agree. Some must go ahead of the others. There will be a difference among them now as there was in the days of slavery. The signatures of those for slavery and the signatures of those against slavery now furnish interesting reading. The ministers who to-day apologize for war, and who see no sure defence for a nation except in howitzers and dreadnoughts, and who think that America at the present crisis can do nothing better for the advancement of humanity than to increase the thickness of her armour, are as intelligent, and learned, and honest, and conscientious, and pious as the ministers who do not agree with them. Somebody must be mistaken. A high ecclesiastical position is no guarantee of spiritual insight. Every man must walk by the light he has, and it is not until generations have passed that the world can see clearly which prophets were false and which were true, which leaders were foolish and which were wise. Every man must stand by the right as it is given him to see the right, and leave the result to God. In the fifties the Tabernacle had a pastor who always, with boldness, wrote his name down among the abolitionists, and in the year of our Lord 1916 the Tabernacle has a pastor who, with glad-

ness, writes his name in the list of those who denounce war as stupid and cruel and wicked, who condemn armed peace as a policy that is mistaken, and mischievous and fatal, and who advise our Government to wait until the war is ended, before committing itself more fully to the disastrous program which has overwhelmed Europe with ruin."

Neither must we fall into the habit of thinking New York City leads the nation. While the ministers of the New York churches were signing the letter endorsing the call to arm made in a speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce, the following really Christian resolutions were being passed by three great bodies of ministers on the Pacific Coast ("Westward the course of empire takes its way"), the California State Church Federation, the Los Angeles Ministerial Union, and Southern California Methodist Preachers' Meeting:

"*Whereas,* There is in this world-war crisis a recrudescence of the spirit of militarism, which has attempted to drag the United States into the world war, or, failing in that, to stampede our lawmakers, under the guise of preparedness, into an elaborate plan of military enlargement, calling for not only an im-

mediate expenditure of billions of money, but the inauguration of a plan involving us in endless further appropriations of money and necessitating compulsory military service of vast numbers of our men for such military duty; and,

"*Whereas,* It is the duty of God-fearing men to increase in the world the stock of good-will, and to devise means by which the recurrence of the present world tragedy may be rendered impossible; and,

"*Whereas,* The United States, because of its position and power and traditions, is under bonds to do what it can toward the shaping of the opinion of nations and the moulding of a new and nobler world policy;

"*Be it resolved,* That we look with disfavour upon any plan to increase the army and navy at this time beyond what would be the regular accession to their strength by the application of the prevailing appropriations, which would seem entirely adequate, amounting to over $300,000,000 annually.

"*Be it further resolved,* That we call upon all Christian citizens and upon our representatives in Congress to keep in mind that the Republic is the friend and brother of all contending nations, and that we wish to manifest to

them the spirit of brotherhood in this trying hour of human history."

It is for every young minister to decide at once whether he will throw in his lot with the militarists who are looking *backward* and urging the old method of arming to settle international disputes or with the pacifists who are looking *forward* and urging the *new* and Christian method of conciliation, judicial processes, all mankind one's countrymen. There is no *via media* any longer. There is no more doubt to which side will come the victory in the future than there was to which side it would come in the years when Wilberforce, Whittier, Theodore Parker, and Garrison said slavery must end, and *some* ministers said "*no;* it is Scriptural."

V

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE WARRING NATIONS

THIS is not a topic on which one should be too dogmatic, at just this time. Of all times in the world, the present would be hardest to define, to describe, or even to see as it really is. All conditions are abnormal. Nations are half mad, frenzied, keyed up, and no expression, either of faith or hate, should be given too much credence. Nations are intoxicated and say things, as intoxicated men always do, which are exaggerations of the belief or feelings of the normal man. One has a striking illustration in Lissauer's "Hymn of Hate" against England. He and all Germany sang it heartily a year ago. Now they are all—even the author—ashamed of it, and disavowing it. Then, too, the war has reacted in two utterly diverse directions upon the masses of Europe, and the end is not yet. We shall try to show, from

what testimony we can gather, these two reactions on the religious faith of Europe. One has been of agnosticism, the other of deeper faith.

The war has produced thousands of agnostics both in Europe and America. We have watched the European and American papers with much interest to find letters and articles on this subject, and we have an interesting collection. This reaction is not confined to Europe only, but has found wide expression in America. It is an agnosticism toward man as well as toward God. A well-known New York physician remarked to us not long ago: "I have lost my faith in humanity. I cannot see that these millions of men now engaged in blowing each other's heads off, and hating each other with a hatred not found even in wolves, are one whit better than our old cave-dwelling ancestors. The only difference is, the modern savage has guns, while the ancient had only clubs." Perhaps the most striking expression of this reaction that has been uttered in America has come from ex-President Eliot. He writes in a letter to the "New York Times" as follows: "For nineteen hundred years the ethics of Jesus of Nazareth have been in the world but have had

no effect to prevent or even reduce the evils of war, the greatest of the evils which afflict mankind. The ethical doctrines of Christianity in regard to justice, humility and mercy have not found expression in the relations between Christian nations, whether in peace or at war, or indeed in the history of institutional Christianity itself. At this moment none of the Christian churches has had any influence to prevent the catastrophe which has overtaken Europe. They are all alike in this respect—Greek, Roman, Lutheran and Anglican. Each national church supports the national government, and every ruler is as sure of his God's approval as ever Israel was of Jehovah's; and within each nation all the religions represented—Hebrew, Catholic, Protestant and Mohammedan—unite in the support of the national government gone to war. So far as the advent of universal peace is concerned, one form of Christianity is as good as another; and all are helpless."

If President Eliot stood alone it would be different; but he represents a great number, as the widespread evidence shows. Only the other day a great man said: "Christianity cannot stand this sort of thing many times more." We recently opened a copy of one of the most

widely circulated weeklies in America, "Life," and the first words that met our eyes were these: "This war has stunned a good many people. They think it is not a Christian exercise, and they ask themselves what Christianity has been about—what good it is—if such a war can tear up the most Christianized continent on the globe." In the "New York Sun" for several weeks a discussion on this question of the effect of the war upon Christianity was conducted on the correspondence page, and this feeling found an echo in almost every letter.

In Great Britain, the instances of distrust of the capacity of organized Christianity to effect any vital regeneration have assumed more an agnosticism toward the Church than toward the Christianity of the New Testament. The common cry is that the Church has turned its back upon the Christian teachings and there is no hope in it, but that real Christianity has never been tried. If tried, it would redeem the nations. There are many striking incidents of this reaction. Thus Rev. Richard Roberts, one of the most brilliant of the younger English preachers, has resigned his fine Presbyterian church on just this ground. His letters of resignation take the ground that

the Church has failed of her great mission and has no word to say in the great crisis. In a recent essay on "Christian Duty in War Time," he says: "This world order in which war is inherent the Church exists to transform. Consequently when the Church ranges itself in support of the method of war it is not only proclaiming its own failure, but it is hauling down its own flag and hoisting instead the flag of the world. It is giving its case away and 'queering its own pitch.' Christian leaders who have given their blessing to this war will be hard put to it at the close of the war to meet the arguments of the militarists. They have in this instance subscribed to the doctrine of force, and it will be used in evidence against them." In this same essay Mr. Roberts utters words on the truth of which we believe lies the whole possibility of ever getting rid of war: "If the New Testament view is to be retained it is plainly contained in it that a British Christian should be sensible of closer kinship with a German Christian than with a Briton who is not a Christian. That this is not actually so is simply an additional piece of evidence of the modern Church's failure to realize all the implications of its basal principles. If the avowed Chris-

tians of Germany, Great Britain, Austria, France and Russia had been really conscious of their unity in Christ, and had declined to go forth to kill one another, there would have been no war."

A preacher in Oxford recently used these words: "It is impossible for any honest clergyman to avoid preaching about the war. Strictly speaking, there is nothing else to preach about. The war affects all the great topics of religion and all the great problems of philosophy, throwing them into a new light and setting them in a new context. Whatever we might say about these things, the war would make comments and perhaps challenge the truth of our words. If you mention the name of God, the War replies, 'What do you mean by that name?' If you talk of Love and Peace, the War says, 'What has become of them?' If you announce the ultimate triumph of Good over Evil, the War answers, 'Wait and see.' If you introduce the name of Christ, the War asks, 'What right have you to call yourself His disciple?' If you mention Atonement or Sacrifice, the War reminds you that an opportunity is waiting to put your doctrine into practice. If you decry the wickedness of war, the War decries the

greater wickedness of those who stay at home and enjoy the blessings for which others are fighting. And so it goes on."

In an article in the "Yale Review" of April, 1915, by Professor L. P. Jacks, of Oxford, editor of "The Hibbert Journal," in which he discusses the fact that Europe is at last up against "The Real Thing," he uses these significant words: "I think it no exaggeration to say that the Real Thing is bringing many of us to a condition of mind which is favourable to some kind of spiritual rebirth. An unaccustomed honesty is being forced upon us. Fain as we are to go on repeating our amiable generalizations about 'Life,' we find that we *cannot* repeat them. The Real Thing places a finger on our lips, and the words simply cannot be spoken. It is not that we are threatened with universal scepticism; the atmosphere is too keen and the spirit too exalted to permit of any such outcome. But we are shedding our shams and our sophisms and our empty phrases. It is only a question of time, and we shall surely find something to say which we can utter with a full heart. The Real Thing is teaching us. But, once more, shall we *remember* the lesson? 'Quick, thy tablets, memory!'"

Not to multiply such testimonies, of which there are many, let me mention only one more —John Galsworthy's passionate outcry in "Scribner's Magazine," entitled, "Thoughts on This War." Thus it begins:

"Three hundred thousand church spires raised to the glory of Christ! Three hundred million human beings baptized into His service! And—war to the death of them all! Let your hearts beat to God and your fists in the face of the enemy! 'In prayer we call God's blessing on our valiant troops!'

"God on the lips of each potentate, and under three hundred thousand spires prayer that twenty-two million servants of Christ may receive from God the blessed strength to tear and blow each other to pieces, to ravage and burn, to wrench husbands from wives, fathers from their children, to starve the poor, and everywhere destroy the works of the spirit. Prayer under three hundred thousand spires for the blessed strength of God to use the noblest, most loyal instinct of the human race to the ends of carnage! God be with us to the death and dishonour of our foes! (Whose God He is, no less than ours.) The God who gave His only begotten Son to bring on earth peace and good-will toward men!"

We have quoted enough. We could quote the same things from private German letters, although the government would not, of course, allow such sentiments to be printed in the German press. We will not quote any more, but close this side of the discussion with recalling the fact that over four thousand young men and women in England have practically withdrawn from the churches on the same grounds given by Mr. Roberts and banded themselves together in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, whose basis of membership is the teachings of Jesus and whose principles are that love is the great weapon and that disciples of Christ cannot make war under any circumstances. Here are the words of the founder of this group (Henry T. Hodgkin, who stands to the students of England somewhat as John R. Mott stands to the students of America): "What we desire is that the Church may take her rightful place when the war is over, and may at last proclaim a living message with prophetic power, a message which shall direct the minds of men to those great truths in obedience to which the health of the nations is to be found. What they fear is that she may lose her chance of proclaiming that message then, because now she has

not spoken with the note of reality and conviction, and because she has not dared to face the full meaning of the problem involved in this war."

But if one of the reactions of this war has been scepticism toward both God and man there is no doubt but that the war has reacted for a real and deeper faith in thousands of men, both those engaged in it and those watching it. The seriousness of life has come over the men at the front. They are face to face with terrible things, and death runs back and forth among them, their most familiar comrade. It is no wonder that these poor fellows, who had no part in starting the war, many of them mere boys not knowing what it is all about, pawns in the hands of the player safe in Petrograd or Berlin—we say it is no wonder that to these boys there should come a new sense of their dependence on God, of their nearness to eternal things. Rev. R. J. Campbell has beautifully described this rebirth of Christian feeling among the soldiers with whom he has been working in Northern France. Dr. Adolph Deissman in his "Protestant Weekly Letter" to Americans gives the same testimony from young Germans at the front. The French papers have had remark-

able stories of the renewed interest in religion displayed by the thousands of young men at the front who have previously evinced no interest whatever in religion.

What is true of the soldiers at the front is also true of the nation as a whole. It has been more in evidence in the German and French nations, because they have suffered most. In Germany the churches have been filled with people bowed in deep grief and looking for relief to God. Dr. Deissman in one of his letters says: "The strong revival of religious interest that the war has brought about with us has deeply stirred our church life throughout the whole of evangelical Germany. Quite a number of our clergymen have told me that now it was a pleasure to be a pastor. . . . To-day I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the strong desire for God's Word and constraining brotherly love has been the cause of new arrangements and the creation of a number of organizations in our congregations which did not exist before the war. Externally regarded, the most remarkable feature is a new type of service, the so-called 'Kriegsgebetstunde,' the prayer meeting on behalf of the country and the soldiers. From the beginning of the great conflict until

up to this day these hours for prayer and devotion have been greatly in demand both in our cities and in the rural districts. The number of regular hours of worship proved too few, and consequently these prayer meetings were arranged. The people usually gather on week-day evenings either in the churches or in halls; the service is short but intensive, song and prayer occupy first place; an address is not always given, but, if so, brief and to the point." Dr. Deissman, again speaking of some of these services which he attended, says: "I must confess that they belong to the most impressive religious services I ever attended. The small church building, dimly lit by candles, was crowded to the door with worshippers, most of whom could not be recognized, but the great common feeling of humbling oneself under God's will, of joyful confidence and patriotic devotion, united all of us."

Paul Sabatier has the same story to tell of France. France has found her religious self, her real soul, in this war, he tells us in a letter to the English papers. Stephen Graham in his book, "Russia and the War," reports the same feeling of religious fervour as having swept over Russia, taking there, as would be natural, a more mystical form. In England, in

the great training camps, the workers for the Y. M. C. A. report such a responsiveness as they had never found among young men before. A note in an English magazine, calling attention to the fact that Cambridge has lost more than half of its students, says that the whole question of Christianity and the present world struggle has assumed a new and intense interest. Mr. G. W. Hoyland, author of the note, says: "About a month ago some twenty men, among them four or five Dons, met to take counsel together and discuss difficulties. This group has developed into an informal and so far nameless society, touching in all perhaps thirty persons, who meet together for an hour every week. Quite spontaneously this hour has taken the form of a prayer meeting for worship, in which we together wait upon God and seek the guidance of His spirit. What these meetings will develop into next term remains to be seen, but already many of us have found in them inspiration and clearer conviction, and we believe that we shall be shown, as time goes on, what policy we must adopt and what definite work we must do."

It would not surprise us to see arising out of this war a great revival of religion. Men will be driven back upon God as the only sure

and unfailing refuge. Guns and powder have brought no security or peace. Diplomacy has proved a miserable failure. Even Hague Tribunals and international agreements fail when beneath them there is not a chastened, Godlike heart. Millions of people are beginning to feel all over Europe that there is no sure, unfailing thing but God; that in this world are vicissitudes, demoniac and ungovernable forces, wars as uncontrollable as volcanoes, floods and earthquakes. Only the eternal is a sure refuge. Men will shortly be saying, perhaps as never before, "To whom else shall we go? Thou only hast the words of eternal life, of lasting peace."

VI

THE TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

SOCIETY is composed of several units. First there is the individual, then the family, then the city, then the state, then the nation. These units all stand over against each other in certain relationships. Man has relationships with man, family with family, city with city, state with state, nation with nation. The relationships between man and man, home and home, city and city, state and state have been lifted up on to a plane that is fairly Christian. For instance: respectable, decent men do not steal from each other, do not kill each other, do not make suspicion toward each other the basis of life, do not settle their disputes with fists and clubs, guns and swords. This relationship has, on the whole, been fairly well Christianized. It has at last been brought to that point where he who falls short of it is no longer considered either a Christian or a gentleman. Indeed, he becomes a criminal, if he sinks below this high level.

Millions of men are not only not killing each other, not fighting each other, not stealing from each other, but are forgiving each other, practising charity in their relationships to each other and moving toward that goal set them in the Sermon on the Mount. Even all *decent* individuals, to say nothing of gentlemen and Christians, settle such disputes as have to be adjudicated in courts of law or before conciliation groups. All this is true of families, except in some regions where family feuds still persist and these are fast disappearing. Families live toward each other in Christian spirit. States have reached the same high level. A fight between New York and Connecticut is so unthinkable that to mention it is ludicrous.

But while the relationships between man and man, family and family, state and state are approximating a Christian basis, those between nation and nation are still pagan, heathen—in many cases barbarous. Nations live in suspicion, jealousy and distrust of each other, almost without exception. Nations steal from each other, and are not condemned. Rather, do we not praise those nations as *great* nations, "empire builders," who can steal the most? A big nation can go out and

destroy, take the life of a little nation, and hardly any one will protest. (To be sure, we have advanced in this regard, as witness the protest over Germany's destroying Belgium. But it is doubtful if there would have been much protest over Germany's destroying Belgium, had she not been party to a treaty guaranteeing Belgium's neutrality.) Nations still settle their disputes on brute levels, with slaughter, cruelties, guns, powder, shrapnel, poisonous gases, bombs, torpedoes, drownings, with every conceivable invention of devilish imaginations, and it is all considered civilized and proper. Many even plead that it is admirable, excellent and Christian. We ask God's blessing on it, praise it in song and verse, build statues to the men who can kill the most.

So there we have it—one set of commandments for men, families and states, another for nations. "Thou shalt not steal," for men; "Thou shalt steal all thou canst lay thy hands upon," for nations. "Thou shalt not kill," for men; "Thou shalt kill and destroy anybody and everything within thy reach," for nations. "Thou shalt not covet," for men; "Thou shalt covet everything," for nations. "Thou shalt not bear false witness," for in-

dividuals; "Thou shalt lie about other countries all thou canst and pervert their every word and action into enmity," for nations. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," for individuals; "Thou shalt hate thy neighbour with all thy heart," for nations. "Thou shalt take thy quarrel to the brethren," for the individual; "Thou shalt take thy quarrel to the battlefield," for nations. "Thou shalt forgive thine enemy," for the individual; "Thou shalt take revenge upon thine enemy," for nations.

This is the double standard of ethics in the kingdom of God. This is where we are: an individual morality on one side, a totally opposing *group* morality on the other. Individuals living as Christians and gentlemen; nations living as heathen and pagans.

The great task confronting the twentieth century is to lift up the relationship between nations to that high Christian level now pertaining between individuals. Thus will the great consummation of the divine plan of creation be realized, and peace come between nations as it has between individuals and states. And it will come in the same way. Once individuals stole from each other, killed each other promiscuously and settled all their

disputes by force. Once a state of feud existed between families which led to continual bloodshed. (Read Scott's novels and see how it was in Scotland in the old days.) But individuals under the influence of the Gospel, the growth of law and the development of the social conscience gradually passed through such stages as trial by battle and the duel, until they established courts, and finally settled all their disputes by judicial methods and lived toward each other in mutual helpfulness and peace. The states once settled their disputes by war; now they take them to the Supreme Court. Now is the time—as soon as this great war is over—(but let us be thinking of it now) for America and the American Church to demand that at last the nations leave their pagan past and do what men and states have done—establish a World Court, bind themselves by a League or by Treaties to take their disputes to this Court, and use methods of conciliation where disputes arise that are not justiciable.

We say America should lead in this. Europe is too stricken to lead in anything for many years. Each state must bend its energies to self-restoration. Suspicions and hatreds will exist that will make one nation mistrust any

utterance of another. But we are whole, and we can speak without being mistrusted by any nation as having some ulterior end in Europe. All of us who have any heart and who want to make this holocaust impossible again ought to be studying and thinking over these things. Study the program of The League to Enforce Peace, of which Mr. Taft is the head; study the program which The World Court League is putting forth; study the various suggestions that are coming from Holland and other neutral states; study the propositions for Pan-Americanism that are filling the press; study all these plans carefully, so that you may be ready at the close of the war to support any great proposition this Government might make to Europe, or to put your influence behind the Third Hague Conference, where there is no doubt that some of these proposals will be considered —taken up where they were left at the Second Hague Conference. The world of Europe will never be content to go back to the old order. Let us, as a people, be ready to help it into the new.

And, as for the Church, what a task, what an opportunity! Let it begin to proclaim, in voice that shall be irresistible, that there can be but one morality in the Kingdom of God—

that killing is just as much murder when done by a nation as when done by a man; that stealing does not become anything better than stealing when a nation does it; that nations become brutes when they fight with guns and gases, just as much as a man does when he fights with knives and pistols; that revenge is wrongful, hatred despicable, suspicions mean, whether found in a man or a nation; that the gospel of good-will, co-operation, brotherhood was meant by Jesus to apply to nations as well as men, and that Jesus' gospel, that a truly great man was not thinking of rights but duties, was equally the test of a great nation.

VII

A NATION'S TRUE GREATNESS

THE chief reason this terrible war is sweeping the world is this: When we act as individuals toward other individuals we act as Christians, when we act as governments toward other governments we act as pagans. Individuals are largely living by Christian principles, governments by pagan principles. What we call vices and crimes in men we praise as virtues and noble deeds in nations. We hang men for committing the deeds for which we crown nations. We condemn in all decent men conduct which we exalt in nations. When we ask: What makes a man great? we mention those qualities which as nations we despise, throw aside and revile. When we ask: What makes a nation great? we name the very things that make men small, vile and cast-offs from all respectable society. It is this double standard of ethics, one for men, one for nations, that is largely responsible for the persistence of war. It will cease

between nations when we demand of them the same high rules of conduct that we demand of gentlemen. Fights between individuals stopped when men became gentlemen. To-day men are gentlemen and nations are rowdies.

We say that it is wrong for men to steal from each other, but we praise the nation that can steal the most. Most of the colonies of nations were deliberately stolen, and no one ever thought of condemning the nations doing the stealing until very recent years. Even now there are thousands of Christians who will justify a nation going to war for expansion who would shoot a man who began killing his neighbours on that plea. Stealing is a crime for men, a virtue in nations.

We say that it is wrong for a man to kill his neighbour, we say it is wrong to do so even in revenge, or to get certain rights even when greatly provoked. We make it the most heinous crime. In many places we take the life of a man who kills another man. But, even if we do not praise the nation which destroys another, as once we did praise, yet millions of good Christian people condone it and uphold by their lives laid down the nation which does it. We have the spectacle in Europe to-day of millions of Christian people supporting cer-

tain nations in a deliberate act of destruction for which they would have imprisoned any individual for life. Wrong for men to kill each other; perfectly right for nations to destroy each other!

We say that it is disgusting and disgraceful for men to settle their disputes with fists, knives, daggers, razors, pistols. Only rowdies, toughs and savages do it. In most civilized lands even the duel is under condemnation. But almost all Christians in the world believe that this is just the way nations ought to settle their disputes, and see nothing wrong in nations flying at each other's throats on the slightest provocation. When a difference arises between two men, we all think of conciliation, law and courts; when a difference arises between two nations, the first thought of these same Christians is war. When a man makes certain claims against his neighbour and his neighbour makes counter claims, we think of arbitration; when two nations cannot agree upon a question, our first thought is that they should seek justice through trying to kill each other.

We praise the man who forgives. The books on which we base our religion have forgiveness running through them like a thread

of gold. He whom we call Master practised it, even to death. But whoever conceived that a nation might forbear and forgive? We smile at the thought. We would be indignant at the act. Many of us were indignant because Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan even suggested *forbearance* and *investigation* when the Mexican trouble began. Our only cry was: "Let us go into Mexico. Let us revenge ourselves for the lives of American citizens. Our honour has been insulted." This cry was in religious newspapers, in Christian pulpits, to say nothing of the mouths of mobs and demagogues. But we can have no lasting peace until we can get nations which will act like Christian gentlemen when affronted. Perhaps the greatest lesson of modern history has just been taught us in this regard, when the President of the United States by acting toward Germany with reason, good-will and forbearance won the greatest victory of the present war. It is a much greater victory to convert a man than to kill him.

We are forever singing hymns about the meek and lowly, and these are the qualities which the Church has demanded in its saints. But we call the same qualities in a nation weak

and pusillanimous. We call that nation great which is mighty, overwhelming, imperial, irresistible in its brute strength, which by force of arms can conquer, subjugate, force other peoples to serve it.

We call that man greatest who serves his fellow men, and those who are greatest of all in our Christianity are those who have practically forgotten self in the service of the world. But whoever heard of a nation existing first of all for the service of the world? The thing we call meanest in men, selfishness, we exalt in nations. The highest duties of a really great man are toward others; the highest duties of a nation, toward itself. From many high Christian sources we are hearing this: "The first duty of a nation is the protection of its citizens"; "the nation must brook no insult"; "the nation must uphold its honour." What would you think of a man who thought his chief duty in life was *self-protection* or *avenging* his honour? Would we call him great? And yet notice, when President Wilson, rising above this low and universal conception of national greatness, and carrying it up into that level where we judge great men, insisted that the first duty of the United States was not retaliation, not re-

venge, not protecting her honour, not even seeking reparation, but was in the securing of safety on the seas for all innocent people, and the rescuing of Germany from her mad course, how many Christian men in high places excoriated him and spoke with sneers and jeers. When men put self first, they fought day and night. When they learned to put service first, they had peace. The same law will hold with nations. There can be but one greatness, whether it be of men, gods, angels or nations.

Perhaps nowhere is this contrast more widely outstanding than is the doctrine of *rights*. No Christian lives by a doctrine of rights. He lives by a doctrine of duties. He is not worried over getting his rights. He does not go about clamouring for them, any more than did his Master. Even if he did believe he had certain rights which ought to be maintained he will not, if he is a gentleman, insist on obtaining these rights at the expense, hurt or death of others. The State considers him a criminal if he attempts it and condemns him.

The question then immediately arises: Has the time not come when nations should be compelled to respect these same laws? Has

one nation a right to plunge all Europe into hell, or even to make all the other peaceful nations suffer—for all nations suffer vastly from the war of even two—simply to secure its own rights, even where it is recognized by all that the rights have been violated? Has any nation the right to go to war to-day without first consulting all the other nations and exhausting every existing means of securing justice when such a course invariably means the ruin of thousands of disinterested and innocent people, and may mean the drawing of many other nations into the war? What Mr. Taft said at the dedication of the Pan-American Peace Palace in Washington must be applied to all nations. He said that no two nations on the American Continent had any right to go to war and disturb all the others, and that he hoped the time would soon come when the nineteen nations would say to any other two considering war, "You must stop." It is time this came in all the world.

Any nation which to-day, with the present oneness of the world, declares war against another country, thereby declares war against every other country, and the time has come to recognize this fact. No nation can go to war to-day without going to war against all hu-

manity. Has not the time come to say to nations, just as we say to individuals: "If the securing of justice, the obtaining of your rights, the upholding of your honour, promises in any way to disturb the peace of the rest of the world and make all the innocent nations suffer, you must refrain from individual action and do as individuals do: try your case before some competent judicial body by orderly processes of law." As a matter of fact, this is the surest way to get justice in the end. For instance, what is Austria getting now? What might she not have had if she had taken her dispute with Serbia to The Hague, as Serbia was willing to do?

VIII

"CHOOSE THIS DAY WHOM THOU WILT SERVE"

TO every nation there come crises when a choice has *immediately* to be made of a course of action, a plan of life, a philosophy of conduct, on which hangs the whole future, and which determines the character of the nation for years, if not forever. Such a crisis was that when the nation had to choose between whether it should be "all free" or "half free and half slave." It chose to be "all free," and the united, free, prosperous country was determined by that choice. We should have been an absolutely different sort of nation had we made the other choice. But the point is that a crisis came and we had to meet it immediately. "*This* day choose whom thou wilt serve." How thankful every American is that the nation chose the course which it did.

This nation is now very rapidly being forced into another crisis where another great choice

has got to be made, and made immediately. The issue is being so emphatically pushed that to us again come the words of the old prophet, "Choose you *this day* whom ye will serve." And we are not sure but that the choice is as momentous as that made sixty years ago. We have got to choose, and that at once, whether we shall be a nation devoted to the arts of peace, cultivating industry and education, developing our great resources of both men and materials, and relying largely upon our character and good-will toward all people as a means of defence, or whether we shall follow in the paths of the toppling European nations and become imperialistic, base our civilization on the sword and trust in great navies and armies for national defence.

That choice is being very rapidly forced upon us, and all men to whom the future of their country is dear should be seriously considering on which side they are going to throw their vote. The crisis is being forced by four classes of people. First and chiefly, big men interested in military matters, men who are immersed in militarism and who have no faith in any other basis of civilization than force or any other kind of defence than guns. The

second group is composed of politicians who are seizing this opportunity to try and discredit President Wilson, who has already in his superb message called upon the nation to choose the American ideal rather than the European. The third group is composed of those who profit by war and preparation for war. How active this particular group has been in America we do not know. It is well known that they had much to do with bringing this present awful war upon Europe. It is hard to believe that there are men in the world who would plunge the nations into hell to make money; but, as Dr. David Starr Jordan and others have shown, there is incontrovertible evidence that this is so. There is undoubtedly a group in America *interested* in securing "adequate" preparation for war. The fourth group is composed of those admirable but timid people who have been frightened by this European war, and who have not the logical ability to see that it is just what they are urging that caused the war in Europe. Nothing truer has been voiced in a long time than some words of Mr. Bryan's, uttered at Richmond, where, referring to the fact that it was the preparedness for war that helped Europe into war, he said, "Preparedness will

almost with absolute certainty lead us into war." But many good people forget this in their fear that Japan or Germany, if she is victorious, will invade America. Of these good people, in their hysterical state, we can only say what Mr. Carnegie said in his New Year's message: "Meanwhile let us pity and forgive those who urge increased armaments, for 'they know not what they do.'"

This company of men, composed of these four groups, have begun an active campaign to force this nation to abandon the American ideal and to adopt the European ideal of big armies and navies. They are organizing groups throughout the country, holding mass meetings, have a body of trained agents at Washington, and are carrying on an energetic agitation in the press. They have prominent men going up and down the country who are trying to frighten the nation by vivid pictures of invasion by imaginary foes. They are calling for investigations of the army and navy and our coast defences. Some want a vast army on the basis of Germany's. Some have even urged conscription. Many are urging the introduction of military training into our schools and colleges. All are interested in increasing armament and following after the

European ideal of basing national defence upon force; all are urging "preparedness for war," forgetting the European lesson that "you always get what you prepare for."

Before making the choice every American ought to consider well what it would mean. Great and lasting issues are bound up in it. In the first place, it means that *two other nations are going to have their suspicions aroused against us.* Let no one be deceived; this sudden desire of arming America is directed against Japan and Germany. Indeed, those who are urging it openly say so. At the first meeting of the National Security League in New York one of the leaders of the movement spent ten minutes graphically picturing what might happen to America if a certain nation won, and everybody knew he meant Germany. Already this movement has had effect in Germany, and she has not liked it. It therefore means that when this war ceases two nations, Japan and Germany, will not be as friendly to our mediation as they might have been. Of all times in the world to have begun this insane agitation for armament, this present critical, sensitive, nervous hour was the worst.

It means plunging other nations into a com-

petitive armament immediately. America has so far kept out of the armament race. If now the Navy League and the militarists plunge us into it, it means that Japan, Brazil, Argentina, Canada and the rest are all going to build just as hard and fast as do we. And why should they not, inasmuch as they know it is directed against them?

A part of the program of this ardent group of militarists on which great stress is laid is the introduction into our public schools and colleges of military training and instruction in shooting. Do the parents realize what that means? If they do not, let them go to the psychologists. It means that all our boys are to grow up with their imaginations turned toward war. It means that they are to grow up in the atmosphere of the camp, and learn martial music, martial terms and martial principles. It means that guns are going to hold first place in their thoughts as a means of settling international disputes, instead of justice and arbitration. It means that they are going to grow up with the constant thought before them that men of other lands are not their brothers, but *natural enemies*. For when boys are trained to shoot, you have got to train them to shoot something. As a matter of fact,

in military training human forms are used as targets. Professor Vernon Lee Kellogg, of Leland Stanford University, says in "Beyond War" that he found the soldiers among the California woods shooting at targets made in the form of men and remarkably resembling Japanese. That is what military drill is going to mean. It is going to change the whole character, the whole idealism of the next generation. It is going to give us a new type of American—the military, Prussian type, instead of the industrial, cosmopolitan, democratic type.

Again, let us never forget that *militarism is the eternal foe of democracy.* Every increase of army or navy is a direct blow in the face of democracy. Democracy is the diffusion of power among the people. Every increase in armament centralizes that power in the hands of the government; in most countries in the hand of a few officers of the government. Many who are urging vast navies and big armies on the country know this, and it is their fear of democracy more than their fear of outside enemies that actuates their frenzied appeal. It is time for the United States to take warning. Every battleship, every soldier, means so much more autocracy, so much less

democracy. Militarism and democracy cannot exist together. Remember how helpless the German people were in the Zabern incident three years ago. We happen to have a President at Washington who believes in diffusion of power. We can conceive of a man being President centralizing the national power in himself. If he has a great army and navy what can the people do or say? Every soldier means an advance toward that.

Finally, remember that in the making of this choice America settles for good, or for long time at least, whether she will pursue the new way in which she has been walking, or shall choose to follow in the footsteps of the old world and become as Germany and Russia and the rest. For here again we should not be misled. *Most* of these men who are urging adequate armament mean armament like Europe's. Also, the thing grows. A beginning means a tendency. A tendency soon swells into a fulfilment. We have been free from the whole accursed business over here. We have put our trust in our justice to all people, our good-will, our desire to be friendly and steal no one's country or possessions. Our defence has been our character, and our armament the friendly treaties of arbitration

with all people. Our energies and ambitions have gone into industry, education, social betterment, agricultural development, the making free and happy a great people, building up a brotherhood, in kindliness, out of all the races and nations in our midst. This is not only our defence; it is our uniqueness. It is what makes us truly great in the eyes of all the nations. The choice which the Navy League, the National Security League, the militarists, the people who are crying for " adequate " and increased armament are forcing upon us is between this new American ideal and the ideals and ways of Europe. And let us have an eye to what thing the ways of Europe have brought her, when we make our choice.

IX

THE PRESENT ISSUE

THE world is witnessing to-day, as never before in its history, a conflict between two great principles—that of individualism on the one hand, and that of human interdependence on the other. It is an old battle, for it was the battle between the Greek ideal and the Christian, as long ago as when Paul visited Corinth. But it has never become the great issue that it has in our day. Indeed, it is the one fundamental issue. For the great war on in the world is between these two principles, not between Germany and the Allies. The war in Europe has really grown out of the conflict of these principles, as we shall see later. All our literature is centring about it. Our novels are but pleas for one or the other principle. One novel is written to preach that a man has a right to live his own life regardless of the world. The market is full of these books. Another novel preaches that a man should be willing to renounce every-

thing for the common good. Our dramas all reflect the same conflict. Most of them preach that individual happiness is the norm of right or wrong. A man has the right to the woman he loves, no matter how many homes or souls he wrecks. On the other hand, there is a group of powerful dramas preaching the social gospel, the gospel that man is bound up in an organic social body, and cannot do either good or evil without affecting the whole organism.

All our religious discussion is concerned with this question. Not on theories of the atonement are men writing, but upon ethical theories. Nietzsche writes that a man lives for himself alone, and that is right for him which he can get. He has no obligations to society, and society has none to him, except as he can wrest them from it. A really great book is Professor Royce's recently published "Problem of Christianity." It goes clear over to the very opposite principle from Nietzsche—indeed, goes as far over as St. Paul went—and in masterly writing claims that there is no real life by oneself, not even any salvation. Self-fulfilment comes only through loyalty to the community; salvation through finding one's place in the group. It is the

eternal theme in all our economic and industrial problems to-day—has a man got the right to do what he pleases with his own, regardless of the rest of the world? Just at present the issue has been taken up on to the plane of national relationships, and the thinkers of the world are, as in the case of men's relationships, divided. One group says the nation lives unto itself alone and is in no wise bound to take other nations into consideration in seeking its ends, and up to this present time has openly urged that the nation should seek these ends by force. Others are urging that each nation must act as a member of a world family, and act in consideration of the common welfare, even as gentlemen do in individual relationships.

The whole contention has been assuming the form recently of a discussion of *rights* and *duties*. It comes back to the same thing. Shall one strive for his own rights, or for the rights of others? Shall one make the doctrine of rights so supreme that he shall insist on them, no matter what harm it brings to others in securing them, or shall he waive his own rights, satisfaction, revenge, reparation for honour insulted, for the sake of the common good?

Here is the great contention of to-day, and many are feeling that it is according as one views this question that his right to be called a Christian is determined. Not long ago a well-known religious teacher was asked, "What makes a man a Christian?" He responded, "The fact of whether he stood with Jesus Christ for the saving of the world as over against those who stood for saving their own lives." However this may be, there can be no doubt as to the position of the two founders of Christianity, Jesus and Paul. The Gospels and the Epistles are all woven around this one thought, as around a golden cord. The fundamental law of nature on which the Gospel is built up is that no man liveth to himself alone.

Taking this as a basis, both Jesus and Paul rear the great structure whose one central principle is the free, spontaneous, eager acknowledgment that one belongs to a society and that the life both of the society and of himself rests on his faithfulness to this principle. There are men who teach that the individual has a right to his own life regardless of others, but there is no vestige of such teaching in the New Testament, neither can one find it in the great teachers of the ages. For they, with

their Master, have seen, as any one must see who stops and thinks, that there can be no society built up on that principle, no civilization. We are just witnessing great civilizations tumbling to pieces because nations have been living by that philosophy. If the war stops and nations go back to this same anti-Christian basis, it will all come again. It must come. It comes among individuals whenever the law of strict individualism prevails. Every colony that has ever been founded by dreamers, where every one did what he pleased, has gone to pieces. Our modern cities are wholesome or evil just to the extent that the Christian principle of the community prevails, or the old pagan ideal of individualism. If every one should begin tomorrow to live as he pleased, considering the present tendencies in human nature we should have a hell in every town within a month. Some people scorn conventions, but conventions are not arbitrary things. They are fences built up to keep the savages from destroying the city. One man says he will not be bound by marriage, but, being an individual, will live as he chooses. He may not wreck the city, because the fences are too strong for one man to break. But suppose every man in New York began to live on that basis, where

would we be in a year? It is of that we have to think.

It is a striking fact that one of the greatest teachers of modern times built up his whole ethical system on just this principle. We refer to Emanuel Kant. Kant said that the conduct of the individual must be regulated by its contribution to the welfare of society. Whatever contributed to the preservation and upbuilding of the community was good; whatever contributed to its misery and downfall was evil. He called his principle the Categorical Imperative. It may be expressed as follows: So live that the principle of your life may be worthy of being made a universal law. In other words, every man ought to live so as to make his example fit to follow. Let each one of us ask: What kind of a world would this be if all men lived as I live? Dr. Amory H. Bradford, of sainted memory, once gave this principle some direct and particular applications. The result was so suggestive and striking that we cannot forbear quoting the questions here as he gave them:

"Suppose all the citizens of this community were to take the same amount of interest in its affairs, and give to them the same amount of

time and effort that we do, and no more, what kind of a community would this be?"

"Suppose that all men were to do as much to help the deserving poor to get work as we do, and no more, how many of them would have work?"

"Suppose that all our people should give as much of their property, in proportion to their ability, to missions and to moral reform as we give, what would be the condition of the world?"

"Suppose that all who attend church, who are able to be prompt, should be as prompt in attendance as we are, and no more, what time would our church services begin?"

"Suppose that all who buy and sell property should be as anxious that those with whom they deal should get their full rights as we are in our dealings, would there be more or less harmony in society?"

"Suppose that all the whites in the country should treat the coloured people as you and I do, would this be a better and a happier nation?"

"Suppose that all who profess and call themselves Christians should keep as near to the example of Jesus Christ as we do, would

it be easier or more difficult for others to be Christians?"

"Suppose that all men tried to live by the Golden Rule as earnestly as we do, and no more, would brotherly love be promoted?"

"Suppose that all other Christians were as anxious that sinners should be saved as we are, and no more so, how many would be reached by the Gospel?"

We said above that just now the world was beginning to ask this same question in regard to nations. Has a nation any more right to try to live for itself than has a man for himself? It was just because Austria acted on this impossible doctrine of individual rights, and undertook to avenge her honour by attacking Serbia, that all Europe has been plunged into hell. Has a nation any right to live and act unto itself when such action must destroy the peace and happiness of all other nations? The world is beginning to see the impossibility of this doctrine when practised by nations as it has seen its impossibility among persons. It is seeing that no nation can to-day wage a war against another nation, without waging war against all humanity.

X

DOCTRINE AND DEED

IF there was one thing that the outbreak of the present war taught the world, it was that it made all the difference in the world what a man believed. Gone forever is all that shallow talk to the effect that it mattered not what doctrines a man held, what creed he avowed, what theology he assented to—that action, life, deed, was all that counted, that deeds were rarely logical consequences of any doctrine behind them.

As a matter of fact the one thing this war has revealed, in its outbreak and in its long and awful course, is that deeds, actions, in every case, when a great test came, were the *immediate* fruits of a widely held, thoroughly elaborated, tenaciously clung to, system of theology or philosophy or article of faith. The one thing written in outstanding letters against the whole background of the conflict is "as a man's faith, so his actions; as a man's doctrine, so his deeds." Consciously or un-

consciously a man or a nation acts out a creed when the crisis comes. Deeds spring out of doctrine.

It is an interesting fact, that more than a year before the present war broke out, a student and admirer of modern Germany pointed out the fact that the Kaiser in his many sermons and addresses to his people never used the word Christ, but always the word "God," and he raised the question whether the Kaiser did not hold the Old Testament conception of "Jehovah," God of battles, Lord of Hosts, rather than the New Testament conception of the Father, the forgiving, gentle, companionable Spirit revealed in Christ. If this were true, our writer went on to say, it did not promise well for the future peace of Europe or for gentleness as the prevailing trait of the German character. We have before us the collection of the Kaiser's many addresses and what our friend says is true. "God" is the word always used, never "Christ." Furthermore, in many instances the following conjunction of words appears: "God and our trusty sword." When these words are used, they are used as the security, the safety of the German people. Recall in connection with this Tolstoy's frequent state-

ments that the God of the Russian Church was only a magnified general, a warrior, often conceived, he imagined, in panoply of steel.

May it not be that it is because of this thought of God as warrior, King commanding great hosts, imperial Judge and Ruler, with might and wrath as attributes, rather than the forgiving Father revealed in Christ, whose love is all-inclusive, whose tenderness is over all, and knows no race or nation; who accomplishes His purposes by gentle, mysterious moving of His Spirit, rather than by cohorts, is largely responsible for that spirit which believes in might and arms and domination by force as the methods of a nation's expansion and influence in the world? This attitude of things has so impressed one of our well-known and widely trusted thinkers that in a book he has just published he raises the question whether it might not be wise to drop the word "God" altogether for a few years, and use the word "Christ" instead? Seemingly his thought is that the only really *Christian* idea of God is the one we get in Christ, while the war lords mean the Jehovah of the Book of Kings when they say "God." However this may be, according to our conception of God will be our acts and deeds. If we believe in

a severe, martial God, with lightnings and thunderbolts in His hand, intent only on His own glory, power and His own way, we shall, both men and nations, act as those acted who rushed to war for revenge and to inflict punishment and to gain their own ends. If we believe in the Father as revealed in the life, death and teachings of Jesus Christ we shall act, both men and nations, as those who believe that good-will toward all men is the weapon of the Christian.

Again, nothing is more evident than that the present conflict has grown out of a doctrine, a creed, a philosophy, an ideal, as directly as an oak grows out of an acorn. So long as men and nations hold this doctrine, this ideal, just so long then will be wars and strifes. This doctrine is expressed so trenchantly by the great historian Treitschke that we quote his own words: "The end-all and the be-all of the State is power, and he who is not man enough to look them in the face should not meddle with politics. The advancement of the power of the State must be first and foremost the object that guides the statesman's policy. Among all political sins the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible; it is the political sin against the Holy Ghost." There is one philoso-

phy of life. It is held by thousands, not only in Germany, but in Russia, England, France and America. It is that power is the chief end of the State—and of man also. It puts the nation above righteousness, and anything is right which is done for the nation. In the individual it puts success above the methods of its achievement. It puts nationalism above humanity; a frenzied kind of patriotism above the kingdom of God; racial superiority above brotherhood. It made the war in Europe; it will always make it when men hold it as a creed, for their acts will grow out of their faith. On the other hand, if man or nation holds the opposite conception of State and individual, the Christian conception, the one always on the lips of Christ and always dominating his every action, that of service, not power the chief end of life; ministry, not domination, the glory of a man or nation; humanity above nationality; all the world one's fatherland; good-will for all the brethren; a desire to cooperate with all good men everywhere in redeeming and reclaiming the earth; the State existing for the world and for its people; then we shall find men acting as brothers and not as rivals, and we shall have the beautiful *Christian peace* in the heart and in the world,

the peace that comes simply from believing the Gospel.

Again, the absurdity of saying that it matters not what doctrines one holds, what theories underly the State, is being made manifest in every morning newspaper of the world. Read any page, it matters not what the subject, and it is full of actions that spring out of convictions as deep-rooted as are the bases of the mountains. Whether it be the slaughter going on in Europe, the cruelty in our prisons, the conflicts between capital and labour, the invasion of Mexico, the trials in our courts, they all go back to a doctrine which all nations and millions of men hold both *tenaciously* and conscientiously, namely, the doctrine of *rights*. It is a pagan doctrine, and it is producing pagan results. So long as men and nations hold it we shall have wars, quarrels, cruelties and injustices in every department of life. Fundamentally it is the doctrine that *self* is the first consideration of life. It carries with it innumerable implications, such as, the defence of honour; the seeking of revenge for wrongs upon oneself or against the nation; punishment to be retaliatory and *quid pro quo* instead of redemptive and reformatory; size and force the basis of judgment; might makes

right; self-protection the chief concern of life. It is this that made the war in Europe; it is this doctrine that urges so many to cry for war with Mexico; it is this theory that makes much of the strife between capital and labour; it is this that brings our people into court; it is this that creates most family dissension; it is this that makes men and nations enemies instead of co-operative factors in the world.

Now Jesus Christ simply abhorred the whole thing. He condemned it every time He opened His mouth. His death was a protest against it. All His teaching is of another doctrine, and until men and nations, yes even the Church itself, come to believe it more heartily than they do, we shall have all these old evils going on forever. And this doctrine is that of *duty* as the chief end of man and nations instead of rights. Men are here not for *rights,* but for *duty, service, ministry.* The implications of this doctrine are good-will, forgiveness of the enemy, redemption of one's foes. The chief end of man, not revenge, not retaliation, not reparation; the attitude of a man or nation not how can I protect my honour, avenge insults, uphold my rights, but what service can I render the

weaker man, how can I win the friendship of the nation that hates me?

Now, whatever one may think about the taking of the teachings of Jesus literally, we defy any one, *taking them at all,* to get anything else out of them than these doctrines. Jesus' whole teaching cannot be made other than this without throwing Him away—which is just what Bernhardi urges and what all the militarists do. It was only the other day that a clergyman deliberately remarked to us that the teachings of Jesus were not meant for our age. Certainly a great number of so-called Christians in our age shut their eyes to them. A friend recently returned from Europe said: "It is noticeable how little the German pastors read the Sermon on the Mount in the churches these days; and I think I detected a tendency in the British Free Churches to stick to the Old Testament." We should think it would trouble the conscience of some ministers to read the Sermon on the Mount or even the Parables at this time. The words of Jesus do not make comfortable reading to many just now. Again remember Tolstoy's story of hearing the priest read the Sermon on the Mount with its "Love your enemies," and then closing the Bible and pray-

ing that God would send the Japanese to hell. We have had some instances of the same thing in our own country while the Mexican crisis was on—and when we were in delicate situation with Germany, some ministers forgot all Jesus ever said. But this is our point: until *we believe with all our heart* that Christ's doctrine was the right doctrine, and let this doctrine permeate every fibre of our being, rise through every thought and feeling, we shall never have brotherhood, good-will, co-operation, happiness, righteousness, peace; and we shall never have even the beginnings of that heavenly kingdom, for which Christ yearned, prayed, lived and died.

XI

THE WORLD'S INCAPACITY TO LEARN

PERHAPS the most discouraging thing about man is his seeming incapacity to learn from his own experience, or from that of others. Something more than two years ago one of the nations of Europe, in spite of the protest of England and France, in spite of their request that the difficulty be submitted to an impartial tribunal, rushed off to punish one of the little Balkan States for the crime of one of its citizens. Another great nation, also turning its back to England's plea for arbitration, backed Austria in this deed, and thus all Europe was plunged into bloodshed. And yet it was only two years before this that all of these Balkan States, of which Serbia was one, had been engaged in slaughtering and butchering one another, absolutely to no purpose, and with a ferocity unequalled in any war, except this war in which the nations are now engaged. This protracted Bal-

kan war had been carefully studied. The report was well known in every European nation, namely, that nothing but slaughter, misery, hatred and poverty had come out of the first half of the war, when the so-called Christian States were arrayed against the Turk; and that nothing but more slaughter, misery, hatred and poverty had come out of the second war, when the so-called Christian States, not having their blood-lust sated, rushed at each other's throats. All this Austria had before her. All this she knew. Also she might have known that to go to war with Serbia meant war with Russia, and that that meant Germany's coming in, and that that meant a general European conflagration. Yet in spite of all these terrible lessons right before her eyes, in spite of all these certain possibilities, in she rushed and the end is, practically, suicide.

Suicide, or partial suicide, is coming more and more to be the outcome of all war. For there can be no more confined war, no more wars between two nations. The world has become such a neighbourhood, become so in spite of those who dislike it, who cry "nationalism" in a world where their own inventions make their kind of nationalism impossible, that

all wars must, in the nature of things, be world wars. The end of the Balkan wars was simply partial self-destruction for all who entered them. The end of the present war is practically self-extinction for the one which began it. It has meant self-impoverishment for all who have taken part in it, but the two great Powers who were most responsible for it have been the two to suffer most. They, too, are the two who have most believed in war; the two which have refused to ardently support the growing movement in the world to support arbitration and a world court. And the nation which deliberately began the war has suffered most of all.

In the face of the absolute failure of the awful Balkan wars to settle anything; of the inanity of it all; of the terrible suffering as the only end of it, Austria rushes at Serbia, with the result that nearly two and a half years after, while the world pauses on this anniversary day, the only result is millions of dead young men, millions of widows, orphans and heartbroken mothers; millions of starving children; billions of debts; billions of property destroyed; industry paralyzed; long, deep hatreds engendered; seeds of future strife sown as dragon's teeth by the way; Austria

herself crippled, impoverished, made ten times more impotent than ever. All because of seeming inability to learn the plainest lessons history ever proved. How infinitely better off Austria would have been to-day had she asked The Hague Tribunal to appoint a commission carefully to investigate the whole Serbian-Austrian situation, and then to have made a decision fair to all concerned. She might have found this tribunal bringing certain unpleasant facts to her own attention. It might even have recommended that Austria, for her own good as well as justice to Serbia, relinquish certain Slavic territory. But how happy Austria would have been to-day, compared with her present desolation! How the causes of future strife would have been removed—judicial settlements are apt to remove them, while war only makes more! How all of Europe would have been saved this terrible visitation! How the use of courts instead of war would have been encouraged in the future! What an impetus would have been given to international Christianity! But, alas, she could not learn!

The question many are asking as the war drags wearily along is: Will the world learn even out of this terrible calamity the lesson of

the futility of this whole war business? A good many are saying: "This will be the last war. The world will be so sick and tired of war that it will never want another. The people will forbid it, even if the governments want it." Well, we do not know. We have seen so much of the inability of people to learn lessons out of terrible experience that we do not feel sure they will learn out of this. We heard these things said of Bulgaria after her fearful sufferings of only five years ago; and yet see with what eagerness she rushed into this war almost as though for the fun of the thing. There are rumours that even now certain nations are talking vengeance if they are defeated in this war. Another nation is talking of a trade war to be continued after the war with arms is over. But they know that such a trade war inevitably leads to a war of guns. And as for the people—well, we think many have lost confidence in the People—spelled with a capital P. No one ever spoke bigger than the "people" before this war. We ourselves heard them at one of those great meetings in Stuttgart ten years ago, when German and French workingmen fell on each other's necks and swore that never would they bear arms against each other at the behest

of kings and governments; they would all strike at the first rumour of war and paralyze the government. It was big, brave, beautiful talk, but all these German Socialists rushed to invade France at the very first word from the Kaiser. We fear they would again. As a matter of fact, one of the things this war has emphasized, as the Balkan wars did before it, is that racial instincts, nationalism, patriotism are much more instinctive, deeply ingrained qualities of humanity than is religion of any kind. Only in the elect few in every nation, those who have got as close to Christ as did Paul and John, does Christianity rise above nationalism or racialism when the stress comes. No, the hope is not yet in the people. But no one hopes more eagerly than does the writer that this war may open their eyes to the fact that they are but the pawns of a false game.

And the evidences are not altogether encouraging in our own land. Many came home from Europe two years ago saying: "Surely America will learn the great lesson this sudden collapse of civilization in Europe plainly teaches, namely, that militarism is a delusion and inevitably ends in catastrophe, that armament as a means of keeping the peace is a sham, that nationalism provokes strife in the

family of nations just as does individualism in the family of persons, that contiguous nations cannot live happily side by side while suspicious of each other any more than can suspicious families; that war costs more than it can bring in this era of civilization, and, finally, that any nation which wages war against another nation wages war against humanity, for all the others must suffer more or less, and will probably be drawn into the struggle." All this many who had been in Europe when the war broke out thought that America would surely learn. As one who returned from Europe said: "America ought surely to see the futility of this whole war business." And many thought that surely America would now become a great peace society preaching peace to the warring nations and bending all its energies to evolving some plan for permanent peace, some substitute for war. But it is the same old story. America has seemed just as incapable of learning as has any nation of Europe, and instead of turning from the path down which Europe has rushed, has, in a blind frenzy, rushed right into the same path. The war has proved militarism a delusion and the precursor of the direst calamity the world has ever witnessed, and yet never was America

so crazy over militarism as just now—all sorts of camps for drilling soldiers, military drills in schools and colleges, many urging universal conscription and some States having already got it for boys, and even the girls have gone off to learn how to shoot somebody. We are just like a man who, having seen another man killed by drinking too much whiskey, ran right off and began drinking it night and day.

If the European war has taught anything it is that the whole theory of keeping peace by competitive armament is a sham and a humbug. And yet never has America been so rushed into the competitive armament race as now, and at this writing we are even considering a navy that must be large enough to beat Great Britain. And, curiously enough, our Senators have been using the very sentences we heard in the Reichstag debate some ten or twelve years ago.

The European war has taught us that extreme emphasis on nationalism precipitates just such strife as we are now witnessing. Many thought that America would see this and become the great protagonist of a new and larger conception of nationality, especially since she has so many strains of blood within her veins. But no! Strange to relate, the air

is full of just such Germanic phrases as all the world was condemning before this war. We are everywhere hearing "Americanism," "nationalism" "America first"—all these phrases used in just the same sense that Germany has been using "Pan-Germanism" and "Deutschland über Alles." The United States may be pro-Allies in its sympathy. But it has been *conquered* by Germany. We are having her militarism urged upon us and her conception of nationalism and the State. There is a remarkable resemblance between Roosevelt's speeches and Treitsche's.

Many had thought, seeing that the systematic cultivation of suspicion on one nation of another by press and public utterance had much to do with bringing on the war, that the United States would learn a lesson and turn in a new direction. But no; to get big armies and navies it is necessary to have a foe. So never has there been such a campaign of suspicion carried on as since this war broke out. At first Germany and Japan were chosen. Then it was Canada. Now it is England against whom we are being urged to arm (see speeches in United States Senate urging naval appropriations). Will nations never learn?

Finally, one would think that this country, seeing the horror, the devastation, the suicidal slaughter of this war, would hate war and with one mighty voice of sustained unanimity cry out: "No more of this forever. We will find some new way. We will lead the world out of this morass. Not only do we see how contradictory it is to every word of Jesus Christ, but we see how absolutely futile it is." The Bible itself is no more explicit in any of its revelations than is this war. It is a second Bible. But seemingly this nation cannot read it, cannot learn its lessons. For there never was so much crying after war. Republicans are crying for it, and some Democrats. Generals are praising it, as well as are some clergymen. We are being told as never before that it is the mother of all virtues (witness its ennobling effect on the Russian soldiers in Poland and the German soldiers in Belgium and Turkey). Even Vice-President Marshall has had to go out of his way to warn people that peace may be worse than war. (Can any one imagine any kind of peace being worse than war in Poland just at present?) Everywhere there seems to be a real yearning to get into war with somebody. When the Mexican trouble came thousands thought the chance had come and howled

for war. Mr. Roosevelt started out frantically to raise a regiment to go off to slaughter the already distracted Mexican people. (Did any one ever hear of Mr. Roosevelt showing any such enthusiasm over raising a regiment of one thousand to go over and feed the starving Belgians or Poles? Or did any one ever hear of Mr. Roosevelt spending his time during the last two years contriving anything to save Europe from this horrible scourge again?) It was only at the last moment, and then because the much maligned pacifists got behind the President, that America was diverted from Europe's fate. Is it not strange we cannot learn the lesson of events? Austria had a hundred times more reason to punish Serbia than have we to punish Mexico. We condemn her, and we see the result of her attempt. And yet we want to do the same foolish thing —and do it facing the same very imminent probabilities. For can any one doubt that if we went to war with Mexico that before the year was up all this continent, Canada and the South American States, as well as Japan, would be in the war?

These things are all worthy of careful thought on this anniversary day. After all, it may be that the hope of the future is not with

governments, not even with the people. Both seem quite incapable of learning life's simplest lessons. Perhaps the only hope is with the little minorities which have always created the new orders. Ever since Jesus and twelve men began the great revolution it has been the little group of prophets who have brought in the new worlds. It has never been the government, the people, not even the Church, but the prophets in all these groups. It is so now. There is our hope. Just as it was the half dozen prophets who got torture out of the political and ecclesiastical systems of the Middle Ages, against the opposition of Church and State, so it will be the little group who, unswayed by the popular clamour, undismayed by seeming failures, find war and all preparation for war absolutely at issue with every word of Jesus Christ and His whole life, who will ultimately save the world from war. And even the promoters of the League to Enforce Peace will find that when it comes to asking this nation really to join a federation of European States, thereby abrogating some of its own rights for the sake of a new co-operation, putting humanity above nationalism, it will be only the "pacifists," and the most thoroughgoing ones, who will stand by them

at that time, with their gospel that the nation should lose part of its own life for the sake of the world. For this is its logical issue. And only the little minorities see that this way —the way of Christ—is the only way to peace.

XII

THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

PRESIDENT DAVID STARR JORDAN has recently published an interesting little book, "Ways to Lasting Peace," in which he enumerates and interprets the thirty proposals now before the world for securing lasting peace after the present war is over. It is a very valuable and interesting book. It should be in the hands of everybody who is interested in the effort to substitute judicial processes for war, a stable civilization for one subject to frequent relapses into barbarism. Of all of these thirty plans now occupying the attention of the world that proposed by the League to Enforce Peace (called in England the League of Nations) has attracted the attention of the American people most widely and aroused most enthusiasm. The recent conference held in Washington attracted nation-wide attention, enlisted many recruits and raised a sum of money perhaps thirty times larger than any peace organiza-

tion known to history ever raised at one meeting—a sum approaching $400,000. In connection with this the President of the United States practically endorsed the idea, and expressed, in a speech that has gone around the world, the hope that the United States would urge this League of Nations and enter into it with the other Powers.

The idea is not new. As far back as the sixteenth century Henry IV elaborated a federation of the European States, with a central senate, and a proportionate contribution from the various nations to a common international army and navy. *The Great Design of Henry* aimed directly at the substitution of judicial processes for war. Just after the Pilgrims had sailed from Holland for America a young Dutch scholar, Hugo Grotius, wrote his famous "Rights of War and Peace," which looked toward a World Court with some common agreement of the nations, and only fifty years afterward William Penn suggested a general alliance of the European nations to form a Diet or Congress of Nations. A century and a quarter ago the great philosopher, Immanuel Kant, in a tract called "Eternal Peace," pleaded for the political organization of the world. Since his day this plea for some form

of federation has had advocates both in Europe and America: such men as Victor Hugo, Cobden, Bright and William Ladd, Elihu Burritt and David Low Dodge.

The plan for a League of Peace came prominently before the world again when Andrew Carnegie made his famous address at St. Andrew's University as Lord Rector in 1905. He chose "The League of Peace" as the title of his address and advocated the association of the great Powers in a league which should agree to submit all disputes to a common court and should combine all their forces into one common army and navy. Where Mr. Carnegie's program went further than the present League to Enforce Peace goes was that he would have the League keep the peace of all the world, prohibiting by its combined force any two nations anywhere going to war, on the ground that no two nations can go to war without seriously affecting all the nations of the world. Ever since Mr. Carnegie's famous address, which was circulated in all languages up into the millions, the idea of such a League has found champions both in England and America.

Curiously enough, the recent movement has been simultaneous in America and England.

A little over a year ago Dr. Hamilton Holt asked a little group consisting of ex-President Taft, President Lowell, Ambassador Marburg, Professors Giddings, Clarke and Willoughby, Mr. John Hays Hammond, Mr. Short, Mr. Heuston and others to meet at an evening conference at the Century Club, New York. The writer of this page was included in the number. At that gathering the present movement so far as America is concerned was initiated. This group continued to dine together monthly at the Century Club, and there the present platform of four brief articles was practically determined upon. This group then voted to call a national conference in Philadelphia to bring the plan before the people. Meantime a similar series of conferences was being held in England. There such men as Lord Bryce, G. Lowes Dickenson and John A. Hobson were leading it, and they chose the name " A League of Nations." Our New York group kept in constant touch with the English group, and some of the group have had interviews with the British leaders, much correspondence has been carried on, and Mr. Dickenson has met the American group several times. Both Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey have openly endorsed the movement. The English name is

better than the American, and it is too bad that the American group did not adopt that name, as it defines the main purpose better than the term "League to Enforce Peace." For any league of nations must have many functions beyond merely enforcing or maintaining peace.

What is the aim of those in America and England who would have the nations enter into a League? Exactly the same aim in principle as our own nation had when it made a federation of the States. They would make a sort of United Nations of the World, based on the United States of America, except that they do not expect a centralized government. Originally the thirteen States of our own nation had its own army and its own navy. When they federated these armies and navies were combined, and this combined force acted as sheriff and defence for all. It could be much smaller, too, than were all the separate armies and navies added together. The League to Enforce Peace and the League of Nations would have the Powers form a sort of federation, each nation pledged to carry its dispute with another nation to a Court of Nations, a World Court, as the States carry their disputes to the Supreme Court, the National Court, at Washington, and all the armies and navies

being combined into an international army corresponding to the national army for the States. And just as our national army will not allow a State to break the peace, so this international army will not allow a nation in the League or Federation to break the peace.

We are often asked how can a pacifist endorse the League to Enforce Peace or the League of Nations? Perhaps we can answer this question with some authority, inasmuch as we were one of the originators of this League and helped to write its platform. We are ourselves a pacifist; that is, we believe in the substitution of judicial processes for war, and we believe that wars as a means of settling international disputes are archaic, futile and unchristian. But we welcome the League because ultimately it makes for the peace of the world just as did the league of States make for the peace of the United States, and because it will ultimately make for reduced armaments, just as federation of the States calls for an infinitely smaller armament here than would we have if every State of our fifty was in the rivalry of State armies and navies. Mr. Holt used an illustration in Washington that is, to our mind, a very close analogy. He said that in the frontier days

a community of forty cowboys existed. Every one was armed to the teeth. Every one was his own sheriff, and there was continual warfare among these individuals. One day they organized into a community and appointed two sheriffs. All the guns and knives were pooled, and these two sheriffs only allowed to carry arms. They, with *two* guns over against the former *forty,* preserved the peace of the community and brought any breaker of it before the local court, or the justice of the peace. This is what the originators of the League want the nations to do.

Two unfortunate things have somewhat frightened many pacifists away. First was the placing of the word *enforce* in the name. This was not originally in. It was put in at the Philadelphia meeting with a very large opposition vote, in which we took part. As we said before, it would have been much better to have taken as a name "The League of Nations." The other has been the utterly unwarranted use of the ideal of a League of Nations in which the United States should take part by the militarists to urge a huge increase in the army and navy of the United States, on the ground that we need it as our contribution to the international army and

navy. As a matter of fact, the League to Enforce Peace has never taken any stand on this matter. Its members number many who think our army and navy are large enough, many who believe they should be increased. At an early meeting of the officers of the League a resolution was passed to the effect that the League take no stand on this matter and that men of all shades of opinion should be received into its membership and be eligible for official positions in it. Only the other day when an ardent militarist wished to link up the League with a movement for increased defence he was told he could not do so. Nothing in the platform of the League bears in any way upon the question of "preparedness." Indeed, the two men who had most to do with originating it entered upon the movement because it seemed the only and the *shortest* road to gradual disarmament to the lowest point possible for the world before the millennium shall have come.

XIII

WHY NOT A LEAGUE OF THE AMERICAN NATIONS?

ALMOST annually some distinguished American visits all the South American States as an ambassador of our good-will. Such men as Messrs. Roosevelt, Root, Shepherd, Bryan and Burton have made this tour and been most cordially received. Through the Pan-American Union the relationship of all the American nations has been growing more and more intimate. Our acceptance of the offer of Argentina, Chile and Brazil to mediate in the Mexican problem created most favourable impression in South America. The European war has developed a new community of interest among the nations of this continent. It seems as if the Mexican problem was on its way to a solution that will ensure the good-will of that unfortunate country toward the United States. In view of this growing community of interest, this new co-operation being manifested,

this fact that the destinies of all the peoples on this continent are more or less bound up together, has not the time come for the creating of a League of the American Nations?

We believe that *now* is the opportunity and the time for the President of the United States to do one of the greatest constructive acts of history. Let him ask every State on this continent to send official delegates to a Congress of American Nations to be called in Washington and then let him propose to the nations represented that they all unite in a *League of American Nations,* a real official Pan-American Union, for mutual prosperity, mutual peace and mutual defence.

Let this League, as its first act, establish an All-American Court of Justice at Washington or some city to be decided upon, this court to consist of nine judges to be chosen by the nations party to the League.

Let all the nations in this Pan-American League then agree to carry all disputes of a justiciable nature that might arise between them to this court.

Let all the nations in the League then agree that where a case is not capable of being settled in a court it shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation to be selected by the

nations, or to an arbitration board to be chosen by the nations involved.

Let all the nations then agree that if any one nation of the League is attacked from without all the other nations will unite in resisting the offending or invading power.

Let the nations of the League hold frequent official congresses, which shall have such legislative and executive powers as the various nations may empower them to exercise. Their conventions might be subject to the ratification of the various States of the League.

We believe the time is ripe for this creation of this League of American Nations. We will go further and say that *the time calls for it.*

Europe is involved in a catastrophe which will absorb all her powers of recovery for many years. She will have great questions of readjustment of her own States, in which we shall have little say. While we wish to enter at once into plans for permanent peace in the whole world, it will be some time before we can do much in Europe. Meantime this war has driven all American States into a necessarily closer unity. This unity should at once be conserved by a still closer unity. It should be a real unity. It might easily be a unity that

would ensure peace forever between the nations of this continent.

Europe is now crippled, and there is no need that fear should possess any nation's heart. But fear works not by reason, but by wild imaginings. So, let it be granted that some European nation might cast envious eyes on some American republic, might be inclined to purposely pick a quarrel as excuse for invasion; let it even be granted that some crisis might arise where some great Power in resentment or revenge might feel bound to engage in war with some State of North or South America. Our Monroe Doctrine binds the United States to enlist upon the side of any nation attacked, but it does not bind the remaining nations to rush to the aid of the United States. But with this League of American Nations we are all bound up together in common peace and common war if it come from the outside. Then whoever would make war against *any* nation on this continent would make war against them all. As a matter of fact, all would be involved in it as matters stand, so real is the unity. But let us have an official unity that we may stand before all the world as *one*. It would be our great defence.

This Union of American Nations would bring about that adaptation of the Monroe Doctrine that has sooner or later got to come. Reduced to its simplest terms, the Monroe Doctrine is a protectorate of the United States over the Central and South American States. It guarantees the integrity of American territory so far as foreign invasion is concerned. It was a paternalism which was greatly appreciated by the South American States in their days of weakness. But it is paternalism, and some of the greater Powers are rather resenting it. They feel that the United States occasionally assumes a dictatorial power she would not display were it not for this sense of being the guardian of the Western world. But suppose the League of American Nations came; then we should have, not the United States guardian of all the other nations, but all banded together in a new Monroe Doctrine of mutual defence of all by all.

Such a League would also vastly simplify the whole question of national defence for each nation in the League. It is a great problem for many of them now. How much shall Brazil and Argentina arm to defend themselves against each other? What navy shall Peru have to defend herself from Chile? All

this problem would be greatly simplified, would, indeed, eventually pass away, if the League were formed and an agreement to settle all disputes by judicial methods signed. Besides this there would be all the force of all the League lined up against the offending State. The question of armament would then become for all the States this: What armament is our share toward the collective force of all against an offending State within the League or an attacking or invading nation from without? How much simpler the defence problem the United States is now considering would become in the light of such a League; at least, how much more logical it would become!

Perhaps some one may say: But this League of American Nations with its own court will retard that larger world movement for a league of all nations with a World Court at The Hague! No, it will hasten it. There will be the example and model of twenty sovereign nations having solved the problem of settling disputes by judicial methods instead of wars. And a Pan-American League with its American Court will be no more hindrance to a World League with a World Court than is the Supreme Court for the States within

the United States—which is a model League of States—to the proposed Pan-American Court. Again, we ask, has not the time come for a League of American Nations? Is it not the great opportunity of America at once to call a congress looking toward this League?

XIV

THE WORLD COURT TO DISPLACE WORLD WAR

IT is a very significant thing that a congress to promote the establishing of a World Court at The Hague should have been held in Cleveland, Ohio, just as the most terrible and repugnant tragedy of the war—the sinking of a ship full of women and children, giving them no opportunity to escape—should have taken place. It has made the whole world shudder. More than this, it has made the whole world say, "There must be some other, better way." But the whole series of events during the last half year has been compelling men to feel that some new way of settling international disputes must be found, for the sinking of the *Lusitania* is but one incident in a long succession of horrors. The civilized world has been growing afraid of its own barbarities: Belgium devastated, with unspeakable suffering of millions of women and children; millions of the best men of eight nations

engaged in blowing each other's heads to pieces with shrapnel; Poland a frightful hell of unmitigated suffering, its cold, bleak deserts covered with thousands of naked children wandering about seeking holes in the ground; Serbia one big, plague-ridden victim of typhus; the best young men of Germany all being slaughtered, leaving the weaklings and incapables to breed the next Germany; heartbreaks in a million homes, and millions of little children to grow up to know no fathers; cities, cathedrals, colleges, farms, homes burned by scores and scores; industries crippled; poverty a gaunt spectre, claiming every land; posterity burdened with a debt that shall demand half the productive labour of centuries; and, with all this, religion made a mockery, Christianity set back a century, agnostics bred by the thousands, and millions of hearts of men filled with deadly, lasting, blasting hatreds. This is what the world has been witnessing, and it really is beginning to feel the futility as well as the wickedness of it all. Never before, at any time in history, have so many men been doubting *force* as the basis of a true civilization. This last act, the sinking of the *Lusitania,* is not an isolated irruption of barbarism through the thin crust of our civilization; it

is a product of militarism, an inevitable concomitant of a civilization based on force, a normal feature of war. War itself is the great barbarity, the supreme atrocity, the final relapse into savagery.

For forty years Europe has been basing her civilization upon force. She has said that force, guns, armament, dynamite, powder and shells were the only things that gave a nation a power in the world, or made its voice listened to; the only defence of a nation against its enemies. They have all said that armaments were the only things that "could preserve the peace of Europe." Everywhere one turns in Europe guns are more conspicuous than pulpits, soldiers more conspicuous than school teachers, arms more in evidence than churches. One nation has spent twelve dollars on preparation for war to every dollar on religion and education put together. As a result of this philosophy of defence and peace, Europe became a vast powder magazine and, as a consequence, when a half-crazed Serbian threw a match into it, it went off. Powder always does go off one time or another. A great Englishman remarked to us that he had come to feel that when armament reaches a certain point, it goes off by spontaneous combustion. It has

gone off in Europe. If, after this war, the nations go back to the same business, it will go off again.

Very many of us in America are losing our faith in force and violence to accomplish either peace or justice. We are saying, "Some new way must be found." We are asking, "What is that new way? What shall we substitute for war?"

The World Court Congress answered that the only substitute for war was an International Court of Arbitral Justice. We already have a World Tribunal established by The Hague Conferences. The Second Hague Conference unanimously voted for the establishment of a permanent court before which nations might try their cases. Had a Third Hague Conference been held the question of the constituting of this court would probably have been one of its chief tasks. The Cleveland Congress called upon the nations to make the establishment of this court the first great task of the nations after the close of this war. It would have as many nations as will become signatory to it, and then they shall proceed to select judges—perhaps fifteen—who shall sit in permanent session as does the Supreme Court at Washington. Indeed the court recom-

mended by this congress to the nations was based upon the Supreme Court of the United States. While this congress was debating the court, another group of men meeting in New York were debating a federation of the Great Powers, and as many of the others as care to come into a League of Peace which shall be bound together by a mutual agreement to submit disputes to this court, and to furnish whatever power might be necessary to enforce its decisions. (It is very doubtful if much power would ever be needed.)

We believe that the world is ready to try this World Court as the battlefield of the future. We believe that many in Europe are seeing the futility of war and are ready to try the court. What we wish to do here is to point to some signs that indicate its possibility and its success.

First of all, the history of the evolution of judicial processes in individual relationships confirms us in believing that the principle of evolution from force to reason will hold good among nations. Once individuals settled all their disputes by force, by that free fighting in which nations are now indulging, by swords, by killing each other, by extermination. After a while they worked out of this up into the

"trial by battle." Then they passed on to the stage of the duel. This was an advance, because the principle of "regulation" entered into the duel. But civilized men have passed beyond the stage of the duel. They have come up into the world of courts. No gentleman now settles disputes by fists or swords or guns. Many men have even passed beyond courts and are settling disputes by arbitration, by conference and by Christian forbearance and forgiveness. "Come now, let us reason together," has become the principle of all good men.

The States within the nation have passed through the same stages of evolution and reached the same high level. Once the States within the United States were disposed to go to war with each other and to settle their disputes by force. Then the Supreme Court of the United States was established, and gradually the States acquired confidence in it until now war between any two States of the United States is unthinkable. And, for encouragement, it should be remembered that the Supreme Court of the United States waited longer for a case than did The Hague Tribunal which was established in 1897.

We believe that this same principle of evolution will work among nations. Indeed there

are encouraging signs of its beginnings. There have already been over two hundred and fifty settlements of disputes by arbitration. Sixteen disputes have already been carried to The Hague Tribunal. The nations have all been thinking of a World Court and have all voted for it. One of Europe's leading men said to us last summer, "If a permanent court had been in existence in Europe, with representatives chosen by the Great Powers, in whom they had confidence, sitting on its bench, I sometimes think this present war would have been averted." It might have been if the nations had not all been so heavily armed. But the point is this: the evolution from force to reason has worked in all other relationships; it has begun in international relationships; may we not confidently believe it will fulfil itself there, and the court house supplant the gun?

But the most hopeful sign is the rapidly growing sentiment that there can be only one standard of ethics in the world—the same for groups as for individuals, for nations as for men. It is a new ethical idealism for *nations* although it has long been the idealism of all decent men. The trouble has been that we have been living under two standards of ethics —Christian for individuals, pagan for groups,

communities, nations. We have demanded that individuals live as Christians toward each other, but have complacently allowed corporations and nations to live as pirates toward each other. But there is no such thing as a double standard of ethics in the kingdom of God. That which is right for a man is right for the State; that which is wrong for a man to do is wrong for a corporation or nation to do. Taking things or land that do not belong to one is just as much stealing when done by a nation as when done by a man. If it is wrong for a man to take revenge, it is wrong for a nation to take revenge. If it is wrong for a man to settle his difficulties in the street with his fists, it is wrong for the nations to settle their difficulties on the seas with gunboats. Nations are under the same law of charity and forgiveness as individuals in any system of ethics that can last. The law of our country toward Japan is the law that governs us in our relations with our brother in our town. If it is wrong for a man to kill his brother on the streets of his city, it is just as wrong for a nation to destroy a brother nation in this beautiful world. Both the Church and the nation have been full of this spurious, double, unchristian morality. It has

been largely responsible for the unchristian relationships of nations. It is passing very fast, and the most hopeful augury of a new internationalism is this arising in the race conscience of a morality really Christian and single, in which communities and nations are accountable at the same bar of righteousness as is a man.

Finally, there is a rapidly growing sentiment that the time has come for nations to live by a doctrine of *duties* rather than of *rights,* as all good Christian men do. The Christian gentleman has long ago ceased thinking all the time about getting rights or avenging his honour. He considers his life as a mission, as did his Master. He is one sent to lift up the world, not to get his own rights. But granting that this ideal may be too high for any but the saints, that it may be asking too much of even the average good Christian to abnegate contention for his rights at all times and under even the most provoking circumstances, even granting that at times he may be fairly justified in standing up for his rights, every Christian, even the most indifferent one, has reached the stage where he will not insist on obtaining his own rights at the expense of the discomfort and suffering of the whole neighbourhood. Even

the State, which does not technically call itself Christian, takes this matter into its own hands and sees that no single citizen undertakes the securing of rights and justice or the defending of his honour in any way that may work injury to others. The community is above the individual, and no matter how just our own grievance may be we have no right to set about righting it or punishing our enemy if it is going in any wise to make others suffer. This is recognized in every civilized town. One must not take justice into his own hands, not only because no man is a good judge of his own case, but chiefly because he is sure to disturb the welfare of the community. One may say he has a right to do as he will in his own house and grounds. If by adhering to those rights he violates the common laws of health and threatens the town with typhoid fever, he immediately finds he has no right at all to do these things. Individual rights may never be secured at the expense of the common rights. This is so recognized in civilized lands that it is rare that even the worst types of men will jeopardize the lives of women and children in the pursuit of their seeming rights.

The question then immediately arises: has the time not come when nations should be com-

pelled to respect these same laws? Has one nation the right to plunge all Europe into hell, or even to make all the other peaceful nations suffer—for all nations suffer vastly from the war of even two—simply to secure its own rights, even where it is recognized by all that the rights have been violated? Has any nation the right to go to war to-day without first consulting all the other nations and exhausting every existing means of securing justice when such a course invariably means the ruin of thousands of disinterested and innocent people, and may mean the drawing of many other nations into the war? What Mr. Taft said at the dedication of the Pan-American Peace Palace at Washington must be applied to all nations. He said that no two nations on the American Continent had any right to go to war and disturb all the others, and that he hoped the time would soon come when the nineteen nations would say to any other two considering war, "*You must stop.*" It is time this came in all the world. We believe many are thinking of it.

Anything similar to the affair of Austria-Hungary demanding her rights from Serbia should never again be possible in a civilized world. It has long ago been rendered impos-

sible among civilized individuals and communities. Nations should live by the same ethical standard regarding the question of rights. How utterly insignificant is the question of Austria's satisfaction and future guarantees from Serbia compared with all Europe plunged into purgatory, as we see it now! And yet this unspeakable agony of the nations, this overthrowing almost of civilization, is due to one nation insisting on getting her rights, regardless of the rest of the world. Even though Austria had not foreseen a European conflagration, and believed that no other nation would interfere with her punishment of Serbia, she had no right, in our modern complex and intertwined civilization, to precipitate the general disturbance of Europe's orderly progress that even a war confined to the two nations would create. But there is every reason to believe that Austria had general warning that this course of inflicting punishment on Serbia and protecting her future rights would draw other nations into the conflict. Such a course was nothing more than a crime against all humanity, regardless of the justice of the cause.

Any nation which to-day, with the present oneness of the world, *declares war against an-*

other country thereby declares war against every other country, and the time has come to recognize this fact. No nation can go to war to-day without going to war against all humanity. Has not the time come to say to nations, just as we say to individuals: "If the securing of justice, the obtaining of your rights, the upholding of your honour, promises in any way to disturb the peace of the rest of the world and make all the innocent nations suffer, you must refrain from individual action and do as individuals do: try your case before some competent judicial body by orderly processes of law." As a matter of fact, this is the surest way to get justice in the end. And many are thinking this way and demanding that there be a court where those who insist on rights may obtain them, without involving all the rest of the world.

XV

THE BEST NATIONAL DEFENCE

ON the morning following last Memorial Sunday the report appeared in many papers that on the previous day hundreds of churches took up an offering for the victims of the war in Europe. Whereupon we said to ourselves: If the United States needed defence from European invasion, as the various leaders of the preparedness movement say she does, these offerings to Europe's starving women and children are better protection than all the gunboats we could build.

It is this thought we should like to develop a little here. It is very evident that there is a more or less widespread feeling of bitterness toward the United States in Germany, Great Britain and France. As we have already said, it is not fundamentally due to our sale of munitions to the Allies, nor to our refusal to take part in the war. The real reason is that our brothers feel that we are growing rich out of their poverty, becoming commercially great

out of their distresses, and while thus prospering mightily are hardly bearing any of their burdens upon our hearts, are not entering into their sufferings, are not making any sacrifice even distantly approaching theirs. They do not blame us for getting rich. We cannot help that. The new commerce we have gained was commerce Europe was forced to drop. The vast supplies South America was buying from Germany she must now buy from us. Our own factories must supply what once we imported. On the other hand, the factories of the warring nations being closed, their fields not yielding sufficient food for great armies, there not being sufficient men to till these fields, they must buy great cargoes of meat and grain from us. For none of these things do they blame us, but they do feel that while we are becoming rich, we are becoming correspondingly hard-hearted; they do feel that even if we were not willing to share our comfortableness with their suffering, we ought, at least, to be ready to give greatly out of our superfluity. And we are not. How can impoverished France help feeling some contempt for us when she is bringing thousands upon thousands of Serbian women and children to her war-burdened country to support until the war is over?

And how can Britons help feelng bitterness toward us when they are doing seven times as much for the Belgians as are we? Now, these memorial offerings, could they be multiplied until they had come from every church, could they mount up into millions, poured into Europe would do more than anything else America could do to remove this natural and just bitterness the great peoples entertain toward us.

We are not alone in this opinion. Among several others, three eminent Americans have visited Europe, and they have all come home to say just what we have been saying. In a recent address at Garden City, Dr. John R. Mott dwelt, at considerable length, upon the bitter feeling he had found in Europe upon his first visit; how he found that where that bitterness had decreased, as it had in some places, it was because of our gifts and our splendid work in the prison camps. He then said, that what would give America commanding prestige in the days when peace terms came to be debated would be great sacrificial gifts to starving, suffering, sorrowing Europe. Professor Benjamin F. Battin, the international secretary of the World Alliance, who has talked with almost everybody in authority in Europe dur-

ing the past year and a half, says the same thing. We will let Dr. Charles S. Macfarland speak for himself. We quote from his report of his recent visit to the European churches:

"The one thing which has been our strongest asset of influence has been the relief work of America and the American churches. But it has not been adequate or proportional. I learned in conference with Edgar Rickard, honorary secretary of the Belgian Relief Commission, that, while men like Mr. Hoover had rendered the greatest service, our contributions of money had been disproportionate as contrasted with Canada and Great Britain, although, of course, this is offset by our gifts of food and supplies. Indeed, our most serious weakness is due to the reproach in which we are held because of the allegation, more or less made among all the nations, that we are utilizing the war for our economic and commercial gain. Our best counteracting influence is and will be our work of relief. Again and again, men who criticized our Government and our commercial interests declared that our common people and high-minded men of wealth had largely rectified mistakes in other quarters."

It is to be greatly hoped that every Christian

in America will send something to Europe not only to help them in their suffering, not only to save them from starvation, but also to show that his heart is with them and also to make his own country able to go to the table where the nations shall soon gather to discuss peace terms, as one *welcomed* and as one who *has taken* some part in their mutual tribulations.

We wish now to make a suggestion about the best national defence. We do not believe with Senator Chamberlain that this country is in danger of invasion from England after this war is over, nor with Mr. Putnam that it is in danger of invasion from Germany, nor with Mr. Rea that it is in danger of invasion from Japan. If we ever are invaded, it will be because we have not behaved ourselves. Furthermore, no nation in Europe will be in any position to invade anything by the time this war is over. But for the sake of argument let us suppose there is some dim, remote possibility of some desire upon the part of some European nation to invade America. What is the best form our defence can take? Most will say at once, " Submarines, cruisers, dreadnoughts, aircraft, these are the first line of defence." We do not think so. We believe there is a much better, surer, infallible first line, a mode

of defence not like the old, but new, unique, yet we believe most practical of all. We wish this nation would try it. It is this, namely, that the United States appropriate the cost of a few battleships, appropriate about one-tenth of what the preparedness leaders are asking for armament—the sum of one hundred million dollars—and offer it to Europe on condition of her repentance and desire to arrange a peace that shall be permanent, for the rehabilitation of her ruined homes, her devastated cities, her fallen temples, her impoverished peoples!

We would put fifteen millions into Belgium, rebuilding the little homes of her peasants and industrial workers and advancing capital to her business men.

We would put ten millions into Serbia, reinstating it as a nation and bringing back her scattered peoples, also reimbursing France for her care of the Serbians on her home soil.

We would put thirty millions into Poland, both Russian and German Poland. It would not go far, fifteen millions in each, but it would save some from starving, would reinstate some in homes, help some begin to till the soil; anyhow it would awaken an everlasting gratitude.

But would we give to Germany and Austria, France and England, the countries which are

at war? Yes, to the peoples. None of these gifts should be made to governments, but to the people. For it is not the people who make the wars, it is they who suffer from them. Only this week we saw a letter from an Austrian at the front in which he said: "What is it all about, anyhow?" The women and children, at least, have had no part in it, and it is for them we would give. We would have our Government spend fifteen millions in each one of these warring countries to put the people on their feet again and to relieve their suffering. One hundred millions altogether, a small fraction of what the militarists are asking, a sum this rich nation would never miss. We believe it would be better defence, more efficient preparedness than one billion spent on armament.

For the gratitude of these peoples would be so great, such a sense of our good-will would sweep through their hearts, that all thoughts of war would be impossible for generations. Any enmity they now cherish would be utterly annihilated. You cannot cherish hatred toward him who has saved your life. No government, however it might wish to attack us—and we cannot believe that even any government would ever wish to—could move its people to

take arms against the United States. A nation that would attack us after such an act of good-will would be made up of men who would kill their own mothers—and there is no such nation. After such an act of mercy to Europe the United States would not need a gunboat for fifty years so far as Europe is concerned.

Impractical? Just as impractical as the Gospel. It is just what Jesus commanded as the one workable philosophy of life for individuals. And it has been the one philosophy that has worked with them. It would work as well with nations had any nation the faith once to do it. And what might not come out of it beyond even this great thing of which we have been speaking? It would be a new thing in the world. It would set a new standard of national greatness. It would raise the United States to a height of influence and power that an army of millions and a navy covering all the seas could never give her. She could say almost anything to Europe when The Hague Conferences met. All suspicions of her national ambitions would be allayed, for they would all say, "This is her ambition: to do good." It might be the beginning of eternal peace, for it would generate a new spirit of good-will in the world. Any nation in ex-

istence would sign arbitration treaties with us, any nation would agree to join with us in building a World Court. Futhermore, the nations of Europe might say to one another after such a testimony that a nation could be Christian, "Perhaps we also might try this new and Christian way!"

What an opportunity for a President of the United States to immortalize himself forever by doing this great thing! Not Constantine, not Charlemagne, not William of Orange, not Gustavus Adolphus, not even Lincoln, would stand higher than he in all history. And we believe the American people would rise to such a call from its President.

XVI

THE NATION'S REAL FOES WITHIN ITS OWN BORDERS

NOT Germany, not England, not Japan are the real enemies of the United States, but certain evils within the nation's own borders. It is interesting to note that Congressman Richmond P. Hobson, who has been one of the most ardent advocates of increased armament, in his recent speech in New York City, should have said nothing about armies and navies as instruments of preparedness, but should have made the keynote of his address the fact that a sober nation was the best prepared nation. His exact words, as reported in the "New York Times," are worth quoting: "The first real element of preparedness is to be sober. This is the chief basis of German efficiency. It is no longer a mere question of sentiment or of religion alone concerning the use of alcohol as a beverage. Emperor Wilhelm, long before the war, discovered through science the danger

of alcohol in the national life, while other nations have given it special attention mainly since the war began.

"In his speeches at the naval and military academies the German Emperor placed the ban upon alcohol as a beverage, even including the national drink, beer, the consumption of which has been greatly reduced and is gradually being lessened throughout the empire. It is well known that the Kaiser had long ago banished liquors from his own table.

"But now, more than ever, the war has taught the people of Europe the danger of alcohol. For years Germany has dealt with the subject scientifically. At the birth of every child there the attending physician is required to give an 'alcohol card' to the mother or some other member of the family at the time, which contains a warning to guard the infant from all effects of alcohol.

"The war has simply promulgated this good and lasting effect on the future generations of all those countries. According to the official Russian reports on the suppression of the liquor traffic in that country the non-use of liquors has already saved more lives than war has destroyed.

"Scientifically we now know that alcohol produces degeneracy. One child in every five of drunkards and drinking parents shows symptons of degeneracy, if it is not actually a degenerate. And in every seventh birth where both parents are addicted to the use of liquor one child will be deformed. But where both parents are abstainers nine children in ten will be normal.

"People who use alcohol furnish the only species in all creation which does not rise and develop naturally, while animals and other growing things thrive according to nature's rules. Through the evil of alcohol many centuries have brought down degeneracy on the heads of men. That is why nations have perished and left only bleaching bones by the waysides."

As a matter of fact, there is not one one-thousandth as much thought in the minds of Germany of conquering the United States as there is in the mind of the Liquor Trust; there is not one one-thousandth as much plotting against America in Japan as there is in the councils and conventions of the distillers and the brewers; there is not in all the world any enemy the United States need fear one one-thousandth as much as the saloons which have

our cities in their grip. While we are going into hysterics over invasions of Germany and Japan, they are busy fighting their own battles, and are giving us but slender thought. Not so the real foe, the liquor interests. They are taking advantage of this foolish fear, and laying deep plans, and organizing as never before to seize the nation and get it into even a tighter grip. That is the pity of it, that we should be bending all our energies to prepare against imaginary foes, and neglecting the enemy in our midst, and the enemy is not slow to seize the opportunity. It was only the other day that one who knows said to us: "The liquor interests are seizing this opportunity, while the nation is crazy over this preparedness business, to regain what they have lost and make securer that which has not been taken from them." Yes, Congress, which should have taken up the issue of national prohibition, must spend the whole session wrangling over defence programs. The coffers of the societies fighting the saloon must remain empty while the defence societies, security and navy leagues get all the people's money. What a pity we let ourselves become so blinded to the fact that our real enemies are in our own national household, and while we are

arming against fancied foes outside, leave them to sack the house!

Again, while we are making such dreadful stew over the loss of lives of a few Americans in the course of international strife, and going into frenzies over two or three crimes of Germany against United States citizens, we forget all about the thousand times more crimes against United States citizens being daily committed within our own borders. Great corporations perpetrate unspeakable atrocities and injustices against our citizens in every State, acts to make the blood boil happen in Colorado and Lawrence strikes, scores of lives are burned up by shops that violate the fire laws, as recently happened in New York, thousands of little children are dwarfed in factories violating child labour laws, thousands of men are killed by preventable accidents in shops that will not install safety appliances, thousands of men and women have their lives sapped away by having to work in unsanitary conditions—and we forget all these things, turn away from them now to cry for reparation from an outside foe, which, in a state of madness, takes a few American lives. It makes one wonder, seeing what we have described above, whether this sudden hue and cry pro-

ceeds from a real concern for the lives of American citizens or from a desire for a quarrel or a fight. Else why this indifference to the continued taking of life within our own borders? A society has just been formed to protect American rights. Will it turn its attention to the daily innumerable violations of those rights in our own country? Who are our real enemies, the Germans or the Americans who killed the innocents for greed?

What a pitiable sight it is to see a desperate man seeking work while at home a wife and several little children have no fire or bread! We saw it just the other day, some little children shivering from cold and with no food. We put ourselves in the father's place for a moment, and it maddened us! In all our cities families are living in rooms not fit for pigs. In our city streets boys are learning to be criminals, and our jails cannot hold the graduates. Our school teachers are telling us that half the pupils are under nourished. Our whole economic system is out of joint and full of injustices. Girls are driven into supplementing too meagre incomes by solicitation on the streets. And with all these awful facts facing us, with anarchists and revolutionaries bred

by them, we turn from their healing and amelioration to put all our thought and all our money into preparedness against some foreign foe, whom even the most eager advocates of preparedness cannot agree upon. Colonel Thompson tells us it is the Germans, but his ardent co-labourer, Senator Chamberlain, has just told us it is the English, and some one else says it is the Japanese.

There is a fine passage in Dr. Charles S. Macfarland's new book, "Christian Service and the Modern World," which we might much better heed just now than the cries of the frantic advocates of preparedness against outside enemies: "Our age and generation call for a solemn, searching, fearless utterance of solemn, searching and fearful truths. The greatest prophet of the Old Testament, without one hesitating utterance or deviating line, declared that the protection and peace of Israel, in her international relations, were to be secured *only when within her own borders oppression ceased and justice found its way to the abode of her children,* and not until then could the sword be beaten into the ploughshare. Oh, if the nations of Europe had only thought less about their foes without and more about their foes within! We blame them because they

are not democratic either in form or in fact, but perhaps there is still greater danger to the nation that has the form without the fact; that raises hopes before its people which it does not enable them to realize, and ideals before the world, which it sadly fails to demonstrate within itself. Ours is as yet a bewildered and confused democracy."

XVII

THE LEAVINGS FOR CHRIST

THE other day a friend, commenting on the struggle of a certain church to keep alive, remarked: "I have a friend in that church who could subscribe $10,000 a year for its work and never miss it. He spends twice that sum on his yacht every summer. As it is, he subscribes about $200 a year to the church." It is not an uncommon situation. The church in so many cases gets simply the leavings. If one should go through some of the streets where our wealthiest people live he would find that in very many homes the proportion of money devoted to the service of God to that spent on self and home would be about one or two per cent. to ninety-eight or ninety-nine. There are exceptions. Mr. Carnegie's proportions were recently added up and stand nine times as much of his income devoted to service as that applied to self. Others would show the same high scale of service. But how true it is that in the great majority of families the church and the philanthropies get simply the leavings. And yet

Christ put the service first. He devoted all His life and income to service. On His first apostles and disciples He made the same demand. All His words—words which we read in church every Sunday—seem to imply that His followers were to leave all and follow Him. Of course, in our present civilization, which, poor as it is, must yet be carried on, few can be expected to leave all business and follow Christ as did the disciples of old. But there can be no denial that Christ expected every disciple in all ages to put His service *first*. What a revival of religion would come, how mightily the Church would rise to rule the world! The trouble with many of our churches is that only the leavings go to the Church. Food, pleasures, extravagant clothes, luxurious surroundings get the great part of our incomes, and what is left over goes to Christ's service. There are many Christians spending a thousand dollars a year on clothes alone who subscribe perhaps twenty-five dollars a year to the Church. Christ's work is never going to be done by leavings. It is not going to be done by churches whose pastors and officers have to spend much of their energies in keeping the Church alive. What we need is a reconsecrated, primitive Christianity

which gave all it had to the Church, conceiving of it as a great, powerful instrument to serve the world. The true Church is the group of those who, as nearly as is possible in modern conditions, leave all to follow Him, which simply means that they make all else secondary to the service of Christ. How many are doing this?

The Christian Church has always been a missionary Church. The first Christians found Christ such a joy that they could not keep Him to themselves. They had to share Him. His presence overflowed their hearts. Indeed, they would not have counted any one a Christian who was not eager to share Christ with all the world. Even before Christ died they made long journeys to give Him to other men. After His death they started in all directions with the glad tidings. They went to Asia Minor, Greece and Rome. This missionary spirit pervaded the Church for years. It is what kept Christianity alive and spread it throughout Europe. They gave themselves and their substance. To-day it would look as though missions were getting only the leavings. What a piece of news this is that has come from London, that with all the wealth of the United Kingdom enough money cannot

be raised to avoid shutting up the Calcutta Mission, one of the most strategic stations in the East? To be sure, England has a great war on her hands. But there is money enough for dinners, theatres, cigars, fine clothes and such things. The letters sent out by the London Missionary Society are pitiable in their appeal. But our own missionary societies here in prosperous America are always appealing for funds to wipe out deficits. And as the deficits mount up enough money is squandered by Christians in one night to wipe out all these deficits. The extravagant personal expenditures by Christians, those far beyond comfort and rational enjoyment, would triple the receipts of missions. But no, missions can have only the leavings. And yet Christ waits for His disciples to carry His glad tidings to the vast areas of the undiscipled East. Suppose that Christendom should once get possessed of Christ as was the early Church, we would live upon the leavings and give the great balances now spent on pleasure to Christ's kingdom. One who is in the hotel business in New York gave the writer an estimate of how much was spent on the annual New Year's eve dinners in the restaurants of the great city. (It has become the habit for thousands to dine that

night at the restaurants and hotels and champagne flows like water.) The figures would save the Calcutta Mission and pay every deficit of every missionary organization of this nation. Yet many of these diners are church members.

We are witnessing Europe in the throes of mortal anguish. Nations are being drained of their very life blood. Millions of men are trying to blow millions of their brothers to pieces. Millions of women are being widowed and having their beloved boys killed or subjected to unutterable sufferings. Millions of children are being orphaned and starved to death. Unspeakable misery and poverty is being inflicted on millions of innocents. And all this by Christians and members of Christ's Church. Why is it? Because for fifty years militarism has had the money and the thought of Europe, while Christ has had but the leavings. Unless we are to read the gospels with blindest eyes and perverted senses, they preach from cover to cover good-will. Who, in his sane moments, ever thinks of Christ as anything but the Prince of Peace, the Teacher of Love? What can any one get out of the gospels but that all of His disciples are brothers, and that membership in His kingdom is more than citizenship in any earthly country? But

twenty times more energy has been put upon encouraging nationalism than in preaching the oneness of Christ's followers. Twenty times more energy has been put into preparation for war than upon devising Christian methods for settling international disputes. And as for money—Christ has had to take the most meagre leavings. Millions have been spent on armies, navies and armament, on instruments of destruction, to hundreds upon educating the peoples in good-will or establishing Hague courts and other Christian means and methods. Had Christ's ways had the thoughts and money, and war's ways the leavings, we should not have had this awful mockery of Christ. But, alas, Christ got only the barest leavings. (For several years a few Christians tried to get the countries of Europe to set aside one per cent. of their war expenditures as a fund to promote good-will and the establishment of a World Court. At last little Denmark did do something. But even here Christ got only the leavings—$1,000, if we remember rightly; perhaps $2,000—an infinitesimal part of the war budget.)

And is Christ to get only the leavings in America? It looks so. It did not for a while. When the war first broke out for a few months

our nation did talk a little of what it might do to reinstate stricken Europe. It talked of conferences of neutral nations. It talked of working out plans for permanent peace to offer Europe. It looked as though Christ was going to have the enthusiasm of this great nation. It looked as though this nation was going to take the greatest opportunity that has ever come to any nation in history to do, as a nation, a great, superb, Christian act. The President talked of it, and strove to keep the nation out of the war that it might render this service. Everywhere the people were talking of it. The President even said it was no time to urge increased armament. We were rather to be thinking of the service we could render humanity. It really looked as though Christ was to get our enthusiasm, our thought, our money, rather than the militarists. And now all this has changed. As in Europe before the war, armament is to get the substance, Christ the leavings. Have not our readers noticed how all talk of what this nation could do for Europe after the war has ceased since the cry for "preparedness" has grown? Have they not seen one journal after another drop all constructive planning for methods of permanent peace and join the cry for vast navies and

armies? Have they not noticed how even ministers, who a little while ago were talking of the Messianic opportunity of this nation to go to Europe after this war was over and plead disarmament, good-will as best defence, courts for nations as we now have them for States and people, have now ceased preaching this beautiful gospel—the gospel Christ preached—and begun preaching guns? And does it not look as if our President himself had turned about? And has it not even come to pass that those who are still trying to put Christ's claim first for the nation, and trying to turn its mind to think of what it can do for Europe, are ridiculed? Alas, it looks as though here, as in Europe, Christ, the Christ who thought not of protection but of service, was to get only the leavings. And the pity of it! For we can no longer go to the nations of Europe as we could a year ago and say, "Try our way." For an armed nation cannot preach disarmament, and a nation turning to Cæsar cannot go and preach Christ. How aptly Lord Rosebery put the whole thing the other day: "It is a disheartening prospect that the United States, so remote from the European conflict, should voluntarily in these days take up the burden which, after the war, will be found to have broken, or almost broken, our backs."

XVIII

AMERICA AND THE REHABILITATION OF EUROPE

THE war drags on its weary way. But there are signs of its becoming a spent force. The papers of the last few months have had rumours almost daily of ominous uprisings of the people in Germany. Such rumours doubtless have behind them much more fact than finds expression. Recent travellers in Germany bear testimony to these facts. The recent note from Berlin dealing with submarine warfare significantly begins with a confession of Germany's desire for peace. Many statesmen are even intimating that this peace paragraph was inserted as a direct bid for President Wilson's mediation. This view gains farther credence from the fact that the Pope's letter to the President, with its plea for efforts from the United States for peace, followed close upon the German note. While there are no signs given out by the British or French *governments* there

are frequent expressions from many sources that the British and French people are getting tired of the seemingly fruitless fighting. The British government is no longer talking of *crushing* Germany. They are now content simply to gain such a measure of victory that they can demand the restoration of Belgium, the evacuation of Northern France, and the overthrow of the Potsdam militarism—a consummation many Germans wish as well as the rest of Europe. The terrible destruction of life at Verdun impressed both the German and the French people. The war may drag on for several months yet, it may end suddenly. No one knows; but there is a growing feeling that it will not last so long as some have been prophesying.

Whenever it may end, the question is—What part will America play in rehabilitating Europe after it is over? Of course, there are many who have no interest in doing anything for Europe, and who are urging that America should be devoting all her energies to fortifying herself against the nations now at war, who will be so tempted by our wealth that they will not hesitate to inaugurate predatory movements against us as soon as they recover breath. This is the attitude being taken by

the various leaders of the defence movements, and was well voiced by the gentleman who recently in the New York Chamber of Commerce moved to lay upon the table a resolution to take steps toward constructive peace measures after the war, on the ground that such things belonged to the millennium, and that the chief business of the United States was to look out for itself. But that is not a Christian point of view, and those who are truly Christian are anxious to have the United States become the saviour of impoverished, distracted, disrupted, groaning Europe, after the war is over. The more Christian a man is, the more his mind is brooding upon this thing. He realizes that the greatest opportunity his country has ever had will then present itself, and there are many such real Christians left in the land.

The welcome the United States will have from Europe when she offers herself for this great task will largely depend upon what she does before the war closes. There is no denying the fact that, at just this time, there is something of a feeling both of scorn and of bitterness in all the European nations toward our country. It is not due to the fact that we are selling munitions, because it is just as

prevalent in England as in Germany. It is not due to the fact that we did not join the Allies in the defence of Belgium, for it is as strong in Germany as in England. It is as strong in France as in either England or Germany, and France has never severely criticized our failure to protest against the invasion of Belgium. All of these things enter into it a little, but they are not the real cause, nor the things mentioned when one talks with Europeans.

The real source of this feeling is that we are not realizing very seriously the awful suffering they are undergoing; are not expressing any very great concern over their annihilation; are not showing any very marked sympathy; and not sharing in any measurable degree the great sacrifices thousands of brave men are making in Europe. The above words are almost transcripts of the letters and messages that are coming from Europe and of the words we have heard from the lips of Europeans themselves.

There is thus a very prevalent feeling in Europe that we are taking the war very lightly; our merchants taking the opportunity to grow rich; our munition manufacturers taking the opportunity to get great contracts; our

militarists taking the opportunity to put through their long cherished programs; our politicians taking the opportunity to create that cheap nationalism which always serves the demagogue's purpose; but none of us forgetting self as millions of brave men in Europe to-day are doing and making sacrifices with them for the sorrowing world. Their contempt is due to the fact that we are piling up great wealth, prosperous beyond measure—a prosperity coming to us because of their discomfiture—and keeping our prosperity to ourselves. We even leave the feeding of Belgium to the nations that can hardly feed themselves. This feeling is perfectly natural when one remembers that New Zealand, which is bearing her share in the support of the British cause, has given $1.25 per capita for the feeding of the Belgians to our little seven cents per capita.

The very first thing for the United States to do then is to remove this feeling from the hearts of her European brothers, by showing some of that sacrificial spirit they are showing, and as Christ did for us, "enter into their sufferings." We are pleased beyond measure to learn that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has recently

issued an appeal to the Christians of America —an appeal signed by its national committee, representing practically all the Protestant denominations—calling upon them to make, before the winter comes, a great sacrificial offering through the various relief agencies that shall not only relieve millions of starving women and children, but shall convince Europe that we, in our prosperity, desire to enter into their dire necessity.

Nothing will do so much to win for us the somewhat dampened affection of Europe as some such great sacrificial act, nothing can so pave the way for our offering our services when the great war stops. Those who have carefully read the reports of Drs. C. S. Macfarland, John R. Mott and Benjamin F. Battin upon their experiences in Europe have noted that they continually recur to this fact, that it was the relief that we had rendered Europe that immediately awakened kindly response from every man they met. It is what we already have done for Belgium, Poland, Serbia, Albania, Armenia, that has tempered the bitterness. Could we now increase these gifts twentyfold; could we all give to the point that Europe felt we were "touching the sacrificial point even slightly," a wave of good-will, of

gratitude, of admiration would sweep over Europe for us, that would make us welcome in the reconstruction of the new order over there; that would make the churches of Europe feel that the churches of America really bore them upon their hearts.

XIX

MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO GOD

IN these days when men are thinking of the reconstruction of the world after the great war the teachings of Jesus are being examined as never before. It is our purpose to review these teachings, especially as they bear upon the relationships of the soul. What has Jesus to say upon the relation of man to God; of man to his neighbour; of man to humanity at large?

What is the relation of man to God? Many are saying at this time that he has no relation to God at all. The war has bred a great revival of agnosticism, which is reflected in the press and literature of every land. Perhaps Professor Haeckel has summed this point of view up better than any one else in a recent article in which he says, in substance, that one thing this war has done is to banish forever the nonsense of the good, heavenly Father, who watches over His children, cares for them and preserves them from all evil. On the other

hand, if the war has produced a great crop of unbelievers, it has at the same time driven thousands of men who previously had thought little of God to seek in Him the only unfailing refuge in the uncertainties and welter of the present world. As one such has expressed it: "I find no safety or certitude in human institutions. Governments, world tribunals, international organizations, socialism, the Church itself seemingly has no power to guarantee security against the sudden plunging of the most happy and peaceful peoples into misery and chaos. There is no security in this world. I am driven to find it in God."

When one turns to the words of Jesus one finds that it is just the truth expressed by this second writer that He is continually emphasizing. Again and again He is saying to His followers that in this world they shall have tribulations; they shall be persecuted, mocked and beaten; but they are not *to fear*. "Fear not, for I have overcome the world." "Fear not, for it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones shall perish." Yes; there is little security in this world. Human institutions offer no security. They are just as liable to collapse as volcanoes are to erupt, or earthquakes to shake the earth,

or floods to sweep the plains. Wars, pestilences, famines are sure to come. But these are only passing things, cruel for the moment, in an eternal order. You belong to that eternal order. Rise up into that. God is there. Become a citizen of this kingdom of heaven. Then you will not escape the calamities of this world, but you will meet them as a citizen of another world, a world above them and beyond them, a world in which they are but incidents, days in an unending time. Find God, repose in Him, make Him your refuge, then you shall endure in undisturbed peace all this world may send; endure them as He endures, endure them with Him. He is the only unfailing refuge.

What is to be the nature of this relationship between man and God, when the soul shall thus seek Him? The Old Testament makes this relationship one of a subject to a king. The Roman Catholic Church, creating its theology under an imperialistic political order, conceives of the relationship in much the same way. John Calvin never quite got rid of this conception. (One cannot help wondering sometimes how different the great theologies might have been from what they are had their authors lived in a democratic rather than a monarchic

world.) When one turns to the teachings of Jesus all this has changed. There the relationship is always that of a child to a father; a soul to its shepherd; a friend to a friend. Jesus always speaks of God as the Father. He always speaks of His followers as children of the Father or asks them to become such. His most beautiful parable, told purely to express this relationship, pictures a father standing with open arms of love toward his son. He tells of the shepherd who seeks one lost lamb; He says the Father even knows His sheep by name, so intimate is the relationship, and no one can pluck them out of His hand. He said to men who supped with Him and leaned upon His breast that their relationship to the Father was to be as intimate as their relationship with Him. The Father was as He was—and they all knew what He was toward them. Henceforth they were not even to be servants—they were to be friends of God. It is all nearness, intimacy, comradeship. It is not strange that some souls who dwell much upon the holiness and absoluteness of God are afraid of Jesus' teaching about God—afraid that it takes reverence and awe out of man. But there it stands, and Jesus has said it finally and forever.

Growing out of this intimacy of the soul with God, Jesus teaches that there can be the most intimate conversation between the Father and His child. The Father will speak to the child; the child can speak to the Father. This act Jesus calls prayer. And it is just as natural, considering this relationship, as conversation of a child with its mother. (It was not irreverence that used to lead Theodore Parker to pray to "Our Father-Mother God." It was this image of child and mother in his mind.) To Jesus it was just as natural to speak to His father as it was for the child He once took upon His knees to speak to Him while He stroked its curls. He is always trying to present prayer in this light to His followers. It was the most natural thing in the world. It required no times and seasons. One can speak to God at any time. God will speak to us any time we will stop and listen. And this act of prayer He considers as chief means of establishing this intimacy of the soul with God. Agnosticism never thrives among a praying people.

The great aim of life according to Jesus, as far as personal religion is concerned, is to achieve oneness with the Father, and to attain, as nearly as possible, the Father's character.

His exhortations are "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect." His aspirations for His followers are that they may be one with the Father as He is one. We are to be merciful as God is merciful. We are to forgive because God forgives. The peacemakers are children of God. He, the incarnation of God, demands service of His followers because it makes them, like Him, Godlike. Jesus nowhere makes this achievement of oneness, this attainment of perfection, easy. But it is the chief end of life so far as the soul in its relation to God is concerned. And all help is offered—prayer, Himself, the Holy Spirit. This teaching of Jesus cannot be too much emphasized, for it is the one thing that differentiates His religion from all the others. An eminent Chinaman, once Ambassador to the United States, pointed this out. He said the one thing that distinguished Christianity from all other religions was its demand of holiness in the individual and the love of the enemy. He thought neither of these was possible to man; therefore he could not become a Christian. Confucianism was adjusted to human nature, and he preferred it. But he was right in his diagnosis of Christianity. Sal-

vation, according to Jesus, is oneness with God and the striving for His perfection.

Finally, Jesus recognized that man was weak and had certain primal impulses in his soul, which would turn him from this pursuit to the quest of his own ends and to the gratification of the baser instincts of his nature. This turning from God, this seeking the world, this opposition to the will of God He called sin. But nothing stands out more gloriously in all His words than the *forgiveness* that is in the heart of God. God so loves His erring child that, although the child may forget God, God never forgets him. He yearns for him, follows him and finds him, suffers for him, gives His own Son for him, heals him, goes forth to meet him the moment he comes to himself and turns again home. It is the most beautiful thing this world has ever known; the most gracious word it has ever heard, this of the forgiving love of God. So, no matter how far the man has gone, no matter how low he has fallen, no matter how he has sinned against the Father, he can find forgiveness, be given another chance, be restored to his sweet relationships with the Father, find peace again, simply by repenting and seeking again oneness and perfection.

XX

MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO MAN

IN our last chapter we studied the words of Jesus to see what He had to say about the relationship of man to God. In this chapter we want to examine His words to see what He teaches concerning the relationship of man to man. For while half the Gospel deals with personal religion, the other half is concerned with practical religion. In every sermon Jesus always talks both about the soul and God, and the soul in its human relationships.

The first thing to notice as we come to this study is that Jesus begins by putting the relationships of men to each other on an entirely different basis than any before taught in the world. The relationship in the older, ethnic religions is inevitably on a utilitarian basis. In Confucianism we are to treat our fellowmen justly and with kindness because in the long run it pays. It may pay in a very high sense, but still it pays. Even in the Old Testament the writers never got far away from the

tribal conception of human relationships. The member of your tribe should be treated as your brother. But not so the Philistine, the Babylonian, the Assyrian. In Mohammedanism there is no relation of man to man outside of the Holy Faith. In the Greek religions the element of pity for one's fellow rises here and there, but it is always purely pity for an unfortunate creature. The Greek would help a poor fellow much as one of us would stop to take a thorn out of the foot of a dog. As usual Jesus transcends all other motives and bases His teachings regarding human relationships on a high, sublime, spiritual doctrine that revolutionizes our whole conception of society. Here is His first and fundamental word: Every man is a child of God. He is my brother and your brother. I am in his heart, and so there is something of Christ in every human being. "Inasmuch as ye do it unto one of these ye do it unto me." You are all of one family, one blood, one origin, one destiny. You should act toward every man as you would act toward me—or as I would act toward him. Remember, too, that you are serving an immortal soul whenever you serve any man—not a mere animal. It is impossible to overstate this, because it cannot be put in stronger terms than

Jesus used, or than Paul and John used in their emphasizing it.

Basing His teachings on this high conception of manhood, what has Jesus to say to His disciples about their relationship to their fellow-men? His teachings are very explicit. First of all, we are to conceive of ourselves as in this world *primarily* to help the other man, and of every man we meet as some one to be helped. This is a very lofty conception of our place in this world, but one cannot escape it if he believes what Jesus Christ taught in Galilee is to be the rule of life in all ages. We are not here to get things from the other man, and we are not here to get our own rights. We are here to contribute something to the lives of other men, and have not arrived at full Christian discipleship until we think of our life in the terms of mission and every man we meet our charge. Suppose we began to apply that in our modern life: It would mean that the great industrial lord who employed thousands in his great mines or factories would not be thinking first of what he could get out of them in work, but what he could do for them. It would mean that the owners of shops and stores would think of them as their parishes. It would mean that the school teacher would

be chiefly concerned in rearing her pupils into worthy men and women. It would mean that instead of running around asking how we can protect ourselves from the immigrant, the foreigner, we should be concerned, as Christ was, in how we might shepherd him. The teachings of Jesus have far-reaching implications when one really discovers them. That is the reason we are so afraid of them.

The next word that is forever on Jesus' lips, based on this fundamental concept of man as God's child and of every man our brother, is that *service* is to be the highest honour in the Christian fellowship. This is very wonderful and beautiful. Everywhere else office, high rank, kingship, lordship, wealth, success, having many rendering service to one is the highest honour, the coveted place, the niche of fame. It is not so with Jesus. Not only does He directly teach that service is the badge of greatness; not only does He tell exquisite stories to enforce it; but He goes out of His way to impress it forever upon the world by an act of lowliest service possible. Think of the Lord of Life at whose name every knee should bow and every tongue should speak, taking a bason of water and going around washing His followers' feet—most menial service Jesus could

think of! But it has settled forever who is greatest in the company of the true followers of Jesus. He is greatest who serves and who spends his life in ministry.

But Jesus goes farther still and imposes something harder than any of these things upon His followers. Men must live together in this world, and, being human, there will be friction. Interests will clash; misunderstandings will arise; evil men will inflict injury upon the good; the Christian will be sinned against as much as will be the man of the world. It is impossible to live in our world and not be wronged—sometimes cruelly wronged and attacked. Jesus knew this well. Had He not continually experienced it? And to it He directed His attention, for this attitude toward our enemies, toward those who have wronged us, is one of the real problems of life. It is always with us. Jesus met it by flying straight into the face of all the philosophy of the world. The world has always said: "Get even with the enemy. Revenge yourself upon him." Jesus turns to His disciples and says, in substance: The aim of your Christian life is to be perfect as God is perfect. Therefore you must do what God does. He forgives, therefore you must forgive to be Godlike; He

forgives *you,* His enemy, therefore you should forgive your enemies; He seeks peace, therefore you must be a peacemaker in the world if you would be His children; He is merciful, therefore you should be merciful; He seeks the salvation of all men, therefore you must seek the salvation of the enemy, not your own revenge; your enemy is God's child, although he is mean and evil, and God loves him, therefore your thought should be, not how to wrong him or hurt him in return, but how can you please God by winning this erring child back to him.

Now this is very radical,—the world has always said fantastical, impracticable, impossible doctrine,—but it is the very core of Christ's teachings, and if we abandon it we might just as well leave Him out of account for good, take His name off our churches, out of our books and off our lips. But, curiously enough, much to the confusion and dumfounding of the so-called practical men, it always works when it is tried, proving itself to be the most practical teaching in the world. For is not the saving of a man's soul the most practical thing in the world? And does it not almost always follow that the result of your sincerely forgiving a man saves him to

his higher self? This is probably one of the reasons Jesus talked so much about it to the apostles. It was a method of redemption, the great opportunity to save. Forgiveness is also the great healing angel of the social order. Revenge disrupts it; forgiveness constructs it, makes for harmony and peace. But most of all, perhaps, Jesus was thinking of the effect upon the life of him who practised it. It reacted on him and made him beautiful, great in graciousness, benevolent, merciful, as is God Himself.

We cannot leave this subject without noting that Jesus recognized that even with the high motive given at the beginning, these commandments were hard, almost impossible to unassisted human nature, incapable of efficient exercise in a heart untouched with a divine quality of love. So He takes every opportunity to say to His followers: The way to practise these rules of the Christian life easily and naturally is to get love in your heart for every human soul. When you love men it is easy to sacrifice for them, easy to forgive. How easy it is to serve your little boy, to forgive him his affront! Now get this heart of good-will, and it will be easy to serve and forgive all others. And that means that we are simply to get the

mind and heart of Christ. It is possible to us because it has been possible to so many. All along the way of history there have been these beautiful souls whose hearts have glowed as did Christ's with universal benevolence—St. John, St. Francis, St. Elizabeth, King Alfred, John Woolman, Elizabeth Fry, Lord Shaftesbury, Peter Cooper, Whittier, Josephine Shaw Lowell, Phillips Brooks, innumerable others—candles of the Lord. It is for us all, said Jesus, to get that overflowing heart of love that He had for everybody, saint and sinner, if we would serve, sacrifice and forgive easily.

XXI

MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE WORLD

IN our two previous studies of the words of Jesus on human relationships we have examined His teachings concerning man and God, and man and man. In this chapter let us see what Jesus has to say about man's relation to the great world in which he lives. For every word of Jesus implies, if it does not explicitly state, that every man has a responsibility toward the whole world. Indeed, we might begin right here and say that Christ's fundamental teaching on this great subject is that the Christian is a citizen of all the world. There is nothing provincial about Christianity. Mohammedanism may be an Arabian or Turkish faith, Buddhism an Indian faith, Confucianism a Chinese faith, and Judaism a Jewish faith; but Christianity was never connected with any tribal name or national boundary. Jesus gave it out as a world religion, and He took pains to impress upon His

disciples that when they became Christians they became citizens of His world-wide, universal kingdom and that all men became their brothers, all men became their wards, and they were to place their citizenship in His kingdom above all national ties, and were to be more closely bound to the members of His kingdom than to the members of their own country.

It is true that we have never realized this in practice, and that is why we have wars between nations made up of men who are professed disciples of the same Lord, children of the same father, brothers of one another, members of the same kingdom. The present war is really a family quarrel, and could not be did not Christians put their allegiance to kings and kaisers, countries and states above their allegiance to Jesus Christ and His kingdom. Did we make even a pretence of taking Jesus at His word it would be much harder to shoot a *Christian* of another country than a non-Christian of our own. And in either case we would be shooting one of Christ's brothers, which is what war means, if we believe Christ.

Let us see how explicit Christ was on this point, for we have some very direct statements. When some of those who first sought citizenship in His kingdom showed tendencies of

manifesting a divided allegiance He uttered words which to some have seemed the harshest words He ever uttered, but which are strong because they were meant to settle forever the question of where the Christian's chief allegiance lay. He said that allegiance to Him must even come before that to father and mother, brother and sister, home and kindred, to say nothing of the nation. When the test came the Christian would desert everything else in the world for Christ. It might even be that for the sake of peace in the kingdom there would have to be strife between brothers and sisters, but His kingdom came first. What else can the passages in Matt. 10:37 mean but this? What would happen in Europe if after this war German, English, French and Russian *Christians* got together and, in the light of Christ's words, should say: "We are Christians *first,* before we are Germans, English, Frenchmen and Russians. Our chief allegiance is to Jesus Christ. We are all citizens of His kingdom; our chief interest is that kingdom. We are brothers in Him. All this slaughtering and killing of each other, all this hatred and cursing of each other, is denial of this higher allegiance for lower ones. Christians are supposed to love one another, and the

fact that we live under different governments and on different spots of land should make no difference in this love. The strongest ties should be the Christian tie. All Christians are of our own household. All other men are potential Christians and should be the object of our redemptive effort rather than our murdering guns. Let us say to our ambitious war lords, our covetous merchant princes, our proud noblemen, "Henceforth we Christians will not bear arms against each other, for we are Christ's before we are yours, and the success and peace of Christ's kingdom means more to us than any national glory or achievement." What would happen? we ask. Nothing except that Christians would at last be doing just what Christ asked them to do, would be at last meeting the one test He explicitly gave: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye have love one toward another."

Again, Jesus endeavoured to impress this same truth upon His disciples by enlarging their idea of neighbourhood. The Jewish thought of the neighbour was one who was of the same sect. The modern world has got beyond this, although not very far, and thinks of all those of his own country as having claims upon him.

To a German, a German is a neighbour; to an American, an American. But Jesus was so insistent upon the truth that the bounds of neighbourhood were *humanity* alone that He went out of His way to tell one of the most exquisite stories the world has ever known, a story which, with the parable of the Prodigal Son, contains almost the whole of religion in both its manward and its Godward sides. The parable of the Good Samaritan is simply the final truth that neighbourhood is world-wide, that every man who has needs, no matter whether he be in Mexico, Japan, Belgium or Armenia, is our neighbour—just as much our neighbour as the sick man next door. Applied for a moment to the nation, it means that our task in Mexico is to be a national Good Samaritan, whatever we do there being done, not to avenge insults, not to protect American citizens, but to bind up the wounds of the unfortunate country and set it upon its feet. It means that the United States when it goes into Belgium, Poland and Armenia with millions of healing dollars is Christian—infinitely more Christian than when she is discussing her rights and her honour.

Once again: That this idea of the *world* being the Christian's fatherland lay funda-

mental in Christ's mind appears in His frequent demands upon His followers that they consider everybody in all the world as their charge, every man as the object of redemption. Remember how explicit Christ was in this matter; how He directly commanded His disciples to go into all the world preaching His gospel to every creature. Remember also how this implication ran through His general utterances. When the woman anoints Him, out of her beautiful devotion, He exclaims that the exquisite deed should be known forever in all the world. He tells His disciples that He will be with them always wherever they may go in the world. He sees Satan falling as lightning out of the heavens. If He be lifted up—that is, made known—He will draw all the world unto Him. And almost the most perfect exhibition of real Christianity the Church has yet displayed has been her foreign missionary work. For here she has caught the real vision of Christianity, found the real heart of Christ. Does any one suppose there would be any more wars in Europe or America if we should suddenly put the able secretaries of the great foreign mission societies of each country at the head of the governments? Believe us, the world would hear no more talk of war.

XXII

MAN, THE BUILDER

THE first thing man began to do, when he appeared upon this earth, after securing some food, was to build something. He is the great builder. St. Paul used this as a designation for his work. It is true of every period of man's life.

The first thing he built was a house. It was a poor sort of house, but it broke the winds and sheltered him from the storms. It was square, and built of clay, or mud, or stones, or logs. But it was prototype of every house that has since been built. The palace follows the lines of this hut.

The next thing man built was a boat. It was a crude affair, a dug-out or skins over a frame of boughs. But it extended his world and he took a new step in civilization with the building of this boat. This primitive boat was the prototype of the present ocean steamer. They are built on the same lines and principles.

Then man began building roads. With the

first road built, civilization took a long leap forward. Civilization is largely a process of extending boundaries. With roads the boundaries were pushed far back. Man passed out of pure provincialism. The exchange of goods and thoughts took place. All races were enriched by this exchange with their neighbours. Later books and objects of art were carried over these roads and the enrichment was hastened. It was a momentous day when man built his first road.

Probably the next thing he built was a church of some sort. In Egypt, Greece, Rome and England there still remain evidences of temples built in the beginnings of man's existence. In every town in Christendom today there is at least one church which man has built. This was a great day for man, the day he built a temple. For it linked him to a higher world, put aspiration and immortality into his nature, and with this vision of God came a new vision of his fellow-man as brother. His growth went forward by leaps and bounds, when he thus put himself in touch with God in his temple. And right beside the temple, in later years, he always built a schoolhouse or college where God's truth could be

taught. To-day man never neglects to build these two things wherever he may settle.

But above and beyond these physical and necessary things, these things built out of wood and stone, houses, roads, boats, temples, schools, man soon began building vaster, loftier structures, temples not built with hands but of the mind and of the soul. Perhaps the first of these was the nation. Humanity has always been a company of nation builders. The nation assumed various forms, although it was, probably, always the same at the beginning. But it was a great day when man began to build states, nations and empires. At first a structure reared on absolutism, the nation being only a king with his dependents; later a king with a constitution; later still a democracy where the king or president, as he is always called, becomes a servant of the people, rather than a ruler; but always a structure where men are co-operating toward a common end. The significance of this building of nations lies in the fact that man is now living for the community rather than for himself.

Early in his career man began rearing other of these invisible temples of the soul. Among the greatest of these were the eternal poems

that have come down to us. David, Homer, Virgil, Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare—they collected all the aspirations, emotions, griefs, victories, ideals, imaginings of the world and out of them reared such structures as the Psalms, the Odyssey, the Aeneid, the Divine Comedy, Faust and Hamlet. It will be remembered how beautifully Longfellow, in his introduction to his translation of Dante, compares the Divine Comedy to a majestic temple. In the same way the philosopher collected the thoughts and imaginings of man, and Plato builds the Phædro; Kant his Metaphysics; Lotze his Microcosmus; and Berkeley his Idealism. The theologians collect the thoughts of God men have thought, the experiences of God men have felt, the revelations of God in the world, and build up great structures of theology, and we have Augustine building his "City of God"; Thomas Aquinas building the "Summa Theologiæ"; John Calvin rearing the huge structure of "The Institutes"; Jonathan Edwards piling up a structure of closely cemented masonry, "The Freedom of the Will."

But with the coming of Christianity into the world, man's building assumed a new and higher direction than any we have mentioned

yet. The first thing Christ did was to gather about Him a dozen men and say to them that He wanted them to be builders with Him. There were two structures that they, working with Him, the master builder, were to build—*character* in men and *the kingdom of God in the world*. And they began rearing these two structures at once. And they have never stopped. Every *real* Christian has been a builder of character in himself and in his brethren, and also a builder of the kingdom of God in the world. And it is a high and holy task. The man who has built a structure of supremely noble character is a master builder, ranking with him who built the great cathedrals. It is an ever present opportunity. Every young man should begin at the age of reason and try to build a firm and beauteous character for himself and should strive to build character in other men. This is the glory of teaching, whether in day school or Sunday school, and likewise of preaching—that the teacher and preacher are engaged in the task of building characters. We wonder how any one can ever refuse an opportunity to help build a new character in the world. Of course, it is the supreme calling of parents.

We should here like to call attention to the

wonderful opportunity this particular time presents for the building of the kingdom. The work of missions has been seriously injured by the great war. Missions are simply the building of the kingdom of God in non-Christian lands. Let some of our readers who are anxious to help Christ build His kingdom begin at once to study the whole mission situation. Learn all about Roberts College and the American Girls' College in Turkey, the Protestant College in Syria, the Christian College in China, Doshisha in Japan, and all the others, so you may be ready, the moment the war stops, to help rear this part of the kingdom to proportions never before dreamed of. Let others study the mission stations in these countries and in India, so the building may proceed with an energy it has never known before.

Christian civilization has nearly fallen to ruins in Europe. Europe will never be content with the old, fallen, structures. A new international order has got to be reared. Never has there been such a call for builders of the Kingdom of God to supplant the false, unstable kingdom of the world as there will be the moment this war stops. We wish every young Christian man and woman in America would

begin at once seriously preparing to have some part in this building. The building of a fair, beautiful, Christian world structure that should house only justice and good-will. Already the prophetic souls are drawing plans. Leave the question of "preparedness" to the old men—it is an old men's movement, and is mostly being fostered by old men, men who live in the old and passing order—and throw in your lot with those who are eager to rear Christ's kingdom in all the world. There is the League of Peace Movement, for instance, of which Mr. Taft is the leader, which aims at a group of nations which shall league themselves together to settle all disputes by judicial processes. Learn of that. There is the World Court Movement, which many eminent statesmen are leading, which aims at establishing a World Court at the close of this war, where nations may take their disputes for adjudication. Learn of that. There is the World Alliance of the Churches, which is endeavouring to unite all the churches of the world in a movement to establish international good-will to supplant the present international suspicions, jealousies and strifes—a rapidly growing movement. Learn of that. Throw in your life with these great movements and have

some part in building the new "Civitas Dei," —the "City of God."

Once more, there is a great movement afoot for Christian unity. Everywhere men are striving to build a new church, which shall combine all the sects in one glorious temple where Christ's prayers that they might all be one shall be fulfilled. It is going to be one of the great tasks of the twentieth century. Learn that and have some part in the rearing of this divine and holy structure.

XXIII

TWO PHILOSOPHIES OF LIFE

NO one can listen to the voice of the age as it is expressing itself in literature, the drama, the press, even in the pulpit, and especially in men's living, without soon becoming aware that two sharply contrasting philosophies of life are clamouring for acceptance to-day, one the *world's,* the other *Christ's.*

The very attempt that so many good men, including ministers, are so frantically making to reconcile them—always a vain task, for they are forever irreconcilable—is only another index of the fact that the crisis is acute, that the world faces either such a reconciliation or an out and out choice of Christ. But to the average man the straight choice of Christ's philosophy of life with all it implies is almost as much to be dreaded as the frank choice of the world's. We have even had clergymen warning the people against it. But the difference is too wide to be bridged—as it always

has been. The world's view and Christ's are antipodal, antithetical, diametrically opposed, as unrelated and irreconcilable as God and Mammon. And the greatest danger to the Church to-day is that she may forget this. There are signs.

Let us look at some of these contrasting views. The philosophy of the world is to *get.* That man or nation is greatest which can get most, and the chief business in life for either of them is getting. A man is here to turn all the streams into his own heart, whether of wealth, learning or power. The successful man, in the average magazine, is he who has made the world yield most to him, who has used the world to his own advantage. The business of the nation is to get all she can from other nations, and that nation is greatest which can get the most. The nation should be thinking of its own enrichment first.

Now Christ's philosophy of life is opposed to all this, at every point. The word *get* never occurs in the Gospels. That life was a place to get things would sound as foreign in the New Testament as Nietzsche's Ten Commandments. The word forever on Christ's lips is that life is a place to *give.* He who gives most, contributes most to life,

blesses humanity most, spends most, loves most, sacrifices most, is the great and successful man—the Christian. Whenever any one asked Christ how to pick out a Christian He said: "By this shall men know ye are my disciples, that you have love one toward another." The world says the man who gets the most is greatest; Jesus says the man who gives the most is greatest. Whatever else one may believe or have, or do, he is not Christian unless his philosophy of life is giving, not getting; contribution, not acquisition; serving, not being served. And a nation which makes any pretence of being Christian must take this same philosophy of life—that its greatness depends upon its service to the rest of the world.

The world is always looking for the *evil* in both men and nations. Its attitude is one of suspicion. It lives in constant expectation of finding evil in men. It sees the evil rather than the good, when both exist. Expecting evil, evil comes. Looking for evil it finds it. And men, knowing that other men are expecting evil from them, are led to be more evil. Suspicion is the philosophy of the world. It is equally true when one gets among the nations, and perhaps this world philosophy of life—suspicion

—has had as much to do with bringing on the European war as have militarism and greed. Every nation must live in suspicion of other nations. Germany has been suspicious of England, and England of Germany. This mutual suspicion has been the atmosphere of these two nations. And it is growing here. We recently attended a " preparedness " meeting where, before the evening was over, we were urged as a nation to arm to the teeth on suspicion of Germany, England and Japan. All three countries were our enemies, and the speakers urged suspicion of them all. Now this is all utterly foreign to the sweet atmosphere of the Gospels. As one walks up and down Galilee with Jesus, one finds Him looking into the face of every soul He meets seeking the *good* there. And he finds it in Zaccheus, in the woman bathing His feet—in one after another. Never does He look for evil, always for the good. He seemed to believe that the good was there to be found, nurtured, perfected. Surely He would never say, " Think evil of all men." Surely the going about in suspicion of all men, looking at all men with distrustful eyes, is unthinkable of Jesus Christ. So, too, does that nation throw aside a Christian attitude toward the world and toward

the future when it begins to cultivate suspicions of other nations, sees only the evil in England, France, Japan or Germany, lives in eternal mistrust of them. It is the world's way, not Christ's.

The world's philosophy of life is that a man shall be measured by what he *does*. He may live a good and kindly life for years, and then if under the stress of severe temptation he commits one sin—in the world's judgment that places him forever. He may have many rather praiseworthy and beautiful qualities, but one weakness yielded to brings him under total condemnation. And if a good man is judged for one evil deed, a bad man is sainted because of one good deed. The world's whole idea of judgment is based on *doing*. In the same way character is measured by achievement, success by accomplishment. It is very reassuring when one turns to the Gospels to find that Jesus has a totally different standard of judgment. When one listens to Him it is all, not what has one *done*, but what one *is*. This man has sinned. Yes, but what is he in his heart, vicious or good? This man did an evil thing in a moment of great temptation—a crime perhaps. Yes; but is he evil all through, all the rest of the time? Let us take that into con-

sideration. So Jesus would have us look at the man's ideals, his aspirations, his longings, his ambitions, his general tendencies. If these are not evil they must be taken into consideration in judging men. So success from Jesus' point of view, as witness in the parables of the Talents and the Pounds, is not achievement, so much as faithfulness. He who tries and fails may be as good a man as he who succeeds and accomplishes. What one *is,* rather than what one does or says, is Jesus' estimate of manhood.

The world's philosophy of life is *revenge.* "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," would pretty well sum up the universally accepted philosophy of the world, and of a considerable portion of Christ's Church, except that the rule is not quite strong enough. For generally revenge insists on more than a *quid pro quo.* It wants a bigger eye and a bigger tooth in return. If a man strikes you, strike him back, only harder. If he steals, take away from him more than he stole, or put him in jail as punishment. Whenever a man commits a crime the world's first thought is *punishment.* Throw him into prison. Yes, perhaps this is necessary. But for what purpose? Punishment, revenge, to get even with him,

says society. The world holds the same philosophy for the nation. If a nation wrongs us, let us fly to war at once, is the universal instinct and philosophy. Retaliation, reparation, defence of honour, revenge, chastisement —these are the only words the world knows when it comes to international affairs. When one turns to the gospels what a new world he enters! Here *revenge* is compared to *murder.* Here the world's great slogan of " revenge "—the motive of most of our dramas—never occurs. Here there is nothing about punishment as a law for humanity, here there is nothing about reparation. No it is all gone and in its place, on every page, running through Jesus' words like a great undertone, shining out of His life as light colouring everything He said and did is the thought " redemption of the enemy, forgiveness of the enemy, love of the enemy, desire to save the enemy." This is the philosophy of Christ. The world laughs at it, the Church only half believes it, the preachers preach it in generalities, but balk at applying it when the hard event comes, but it is there and you can no more take it out of the New Testament than you can take Hamlet out of " Hamlet." Take it out and nothing is left. Not even Jesus is left, for it is His one distinctive

teaching, His one original contribution to the philosophy of human relationship. When the disciples would call down fire He would have none of it. He had come to *save*.

Now any one who *believes* Jesus Christ and really wants to follow not afar off must get completely rid of this whole idea of revenge, reparation, punishment as mere punishment, and live by Christ's principle. Even his thought of his enemy must be to save him. His thought of punishment must be always redemption. His thought of prisons must be reformatory. His thought of one who wrongs him must be forgiveness where it is possible, because through forgiveness one may save. And some day we shall be big enough to see that no nation can lay any claim to be considered Christian which cannot see that she too must put the salvation of other nations above retaliation or revenge. Which is the Christian policy toward Mexico; to invade her for punishment, retaliation or revenge, or to preserve as a nation the helpful, patient course Christ pursued toward His enemies, and perhaps save the unfortunate nation to itself? So too in all our relationships with the stricken nations of Europe at this time. What *we can do for them* will be the first thought rather

than reparation, revenge or upholding national honour. (Where does any one find Jesus talking about defending his honour?)

The world says *force, might, iron,* is the basis of civilization. The strong man is he who has the biggest muscles, or added force, by which he can awe men. The best defence for either man or nation is impregnable surroundings; vast, threatening, awe-inspiring might; the surest civilization that which has most force behind it. When one turns to the Gospel the whole idea of force is strangely absent. Jesus seemingly would have nothing to do with it, He would not even defend Himself; he would not let Peter interpose force between the marauders and Himself. He does not ever talk about it. It does not seem to have ever been any part of His world. His thought, His word, His acts, all speak another language, namely, the love of others, good-will toward men, service, mercy and justice.

These are a man's chief defence. Ultimately they may be a nation's best defence. Jesus never spoke on this particular phase of political righteousness. But, while it is not fair to say on what evidence we possess that Jesus would counsel nations to refuse to use force against malicious attack or invasion, one must

say, in the light of His whole life and teaching, that He would insist that eager, enthusiastic, devoted service of other nations, with serene trust in them, love and good-will for all, would be securest foundation of the nation, most impregnable defence. Suppose our Government at the close of this war should set aside $2,000,000,000 (two billion dollars) and give it to the depleted nations to reinstate themselves, does any one really suppose that any nation in Europe would ever think of waging war with us? Be sure that the *people* would not permit it, even if governments were unhuman.

Once more: the philosophy of the world is *protection.* The world is all the time concerned with shielding itself. The thousands who hold it are always asking: How can we protect ourselves from the unclean people, the ignorant people, these swarms of foreigners who are coming into our beautiful old towns and cities, from the evil women, from the negroes, from the criminal who threatens our lives and properties? And the world acts on its philosophies. It segregates the evil women and the negroes; it keeps the Italians and Slavs in colonies in the midst of the city; it builds high walls around its houses, gets away

from the crowd; it puts the criminal behind iron bars; it passes laws against immigration. When one turns to the gospels it is never *protection.* When Jesus faced any of the so-called threatening classes of society His only thought was opportunity. What a chance to render service, for here are those who need it most. Jesus seemed never to be caring for Himself, to be thinking of His rights. He had no doctrine of rights, only of duties. He was not here to protect Himself, He was here on a mission. One of the most characteristic words about Him is His standing over against the crowd—the great unclean, unfortunate, disagreeable mob—and weeping because He could not serve and save them all. *Mission, opportunity, service, duty, love*—never *protection*—was Christ's philosophy of life. "We who are Christians have the mind of Christ," said the chief apostle.

XXIV

THE NEED OF THE GOSPEL

WE have been hearing much during the last fifty years of forces other than the Christian Gospel which were to elevate and redeem mankind. Indeed, some have gone so far as to tell us that the Gospel was outgrown and that these other forces were to supplant it: character, the development of the higher qualities of being, the banishment of injustice, strife, crime, social sin, the establishing of brotherhood as the rule of life—all these were to be secured by these new panaceas —these new gospels suited for an age that had outgrown Christianity.

First came the prophets of science. From Huxley's "Lay Sermons" of 1870 to Haeckel's last fulmination we have been hearing that science was to be the saving force, the Messiah, the eliminator of all evil, poverty, disease, crime and sin and the harbinger of good-will among all peoples. "Let us teach the children science instead of the old outworn fables of the Bible."

Then came the prophets of education and from Herbert Spencer's famous essay on this subject down to the last commencement address we have been told that education was the panacea for all ills. Educate the youth sufficiently and they will flee all evil. Educate the people as to what is best and they will choose the best. Show the world how much more beautiful virtue is than vice, unselfishness than selfishness, co-operation than competition, brotherhood than strife, and they will choose the good.

Then came the prophets of culture. We have been hearing the word a good deal lately. For the last twenty-five years it has been on everybody's lips. We have been hearing that all that was necessary to bring in the millennium was the diffusion of art, literature, music, philosophy. The mastery of the world by supermen is to be the religion that shall create the strong and virtuous nation. Not meek men, not suffering Christs, but giant men, commanding men and nature out of universal knowledge, together with perfect efficiency.

With all these came the prophets of economic reform. If we could get an eight-hour day, one day's rest in seven, a good wage,

plenty to eat and model tenements, the whole problem of morality would be solved, we would be over the threshold of the millennium, the redemption of mankind into the kingdom of God would be at hand and religion as ordinarily conceived from the point of the Church would be outgrown and superfluous.

Thus, during the last twenty-five years, have we been offered these four gospels as a sufficient religion, a substitute for Christianity, a panacea for all evils, a potency requiring no supernatural sanction, but sufficient to redeem the world. And what a failure it has all proven in the light of the past two years! There never was so much science in all previous centuries put together as in the last half century. Every school child grew up on it, his primers being fairly tales of science. It has driven the classics out of our colleges, and has bid fair even to become the text-books of our Sunday schools. It is in every magazine, and on every table in cheap editions. Yet somehow it has not worked great improvement in the morals of mankind, and it is just now being prostituted largely to inventing machines and chemicals wherewith to slaughter men. It is even something of a question whether many of our great inventions have not done us more harm than

good. Airships so far have been used chiefly for dropping bombs on playgrounds and nurseries.

Education has never reached such a height as in the last century. Everybody goes to school, and everybody who wants to goes to college. Education has been the chief concern of government in Germany, next to the army. In America the educator is the prophet. The president of a college stands next to the President of the nation. We are even turning to the colleges for our nation's rulers. And yet somehow education does not seem to have had much power to stop this awful collapse of civilization we are witnessing. The men who did most to bring it on had been trained in the greatest universities in the world. Our own cheap politicians, grafters, corrupt legislators are educated men. Yes, education seems to have belied its promise. When they were running some plays in New York to show young men the horrible physical consequences of vice, a wise physician remarked to us: "Knowledge does not keep people from sin."

As for culture, it has become universal. Every town has a library. All the women belong to literary clubs and study everything from Confucius to John Masefield. Every

other home has its hundred-best-books library, and institutions similar to our nation-wide Chautauqua system prevail in every country. Everybody goes to lectures as regularly as to meals. Every home has reproductions of the great masters, and the best music is heard in all the cities. Germany has boasted of her culture, and we are proud of ours. But somehow culture has failed to civilize us, and seems to have done little more than veneer the barbarian in us.

As for economic reform, social betterment, the latest all-sufficient gospel, how absolutely it has failed. All its high-sounding talk has proved but vanity. Those millions of German, French and English Socialists who had banished war—in their speeches and at banquets —were the first to rush at one another's throats. Never had social reform gone so far. In Germany everybody had been brought under an excellent system of insurance. England for the last ten years has been perfecting an old age pension system. Wages had gone up everywhere. The people had shorter hours, better homes, more luxuries. But somehow it did not save them, and there has come over Europe a pretty general distrust of social alleviation as a moral agency. " Be happy and

you will be good," is not the great slogan of redemption after all.

We think that if there is any one thing the great war is teaching us, it is the utter insufficiency of these things to hold men's passions in leash, or to establish that brotherhood for which the weary world waits. They not only lack power to establish that kingdom of righteousness, justice and beauty which Jesus longed for, but they have failed even to make the world a decent or safe place in which to live. There is only one thing big enough to work these miracles and transform the world, and that is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is time to give that Gospel a real chance. These other things having failed; let us now give this Gospel a trial. But it must be a larger Gospel than we have hitherto preached. The world will be a new world after this war is over and we must give it a new Gospel. Men will need the Gospel they have always heard—the Fatherhood of God, Christ's revelation of that Fatherhood, the grace of God for every soul, the forgiveness of sin through Christ, and Christ the way of approach of the soul to God. But with all this there must be more.

There must be emphasis now on the teachings of Jesus. Christ must not only be be-

lieved in, but we must believe *Him.* Not only must we trust in Him for individual redemption, but we must live toward men as He lived. Not only must we accept Him as our individual Saviour, but we must believe that the Sermon on the Mount was given to be a law unto the Christian. Not only must we accept His Gospel on the soul's relationship to God, but also on man's relationship to man.

There must be a new emphasis on Christ's Gospel of the unity of mankind. "All ye are brethren" must be our great message, and it must be preached not as a sweet and pious generalization, but as a real truth to be accepted as a test of Christian faith.

This unity must be dearer to us than patriotism, the love of the brethren more than the love of our fellow countrymen. The kingdom of Christ should be the real country of every Christian, to this should be his chief allegiance. Members of that kingdom, Christ's brothers, Christ's "little children," no matter in what nation found, should be dearer to us than citizens of our own country who are not members of that country. To quote the recent remarks of a famous English preacher: "If the New Testament view is to be retained it is plainly contained in it that a British

Christian should be sensible of a closer kinship with a German Christian than with a Briton who is not a Christian. That this is not actually so is simply an additional piece of evidence of the modern Church's failure to realize all the implications of its basal principles. If the avowed Christians of Germany, Great Britain, Austria, France and Russia had been really conscious of their unity in Christ and had declined to go forth to kill one another, there would have been no war."

The so-called " hard sayings " of Jesus must be much more emphasized in the preaching of the future. Either Jesus meant what He said when He taught " Love your enemies," " Forgive the enemy," " By this shall men know ye are my disciples, that ye have love one toward another," and meant them for the only law of life, or He did not. But they are the core of His Gospel, and if we are to call ourselves Christians we must preach them and practise them.

Finally, the Gospel must be so widened as to include nations as well as individuals. This has been our weakness. We have preached, " Thou shalt not steal," " Thou shalt not kill," " Thou shalt not hate," " Thou shalt not settle thy disputes by brute force," " Thou shalt not

live by rights, but by duties," "Thou shalt love thy neighbour," "He is greatest among you who serves others" for the law of the Christian. We have never preached it as the law of the *nation.* Hereafter it should be preached from every pulpit with the same emphasis that the Gospel for individual relationships receives.

The world needs the Gospel if it is to be saved—this new, enlarged Gospel. Happy that young man who, having caught this prophetic vision, is called upon to be its preacher.

XXV

WHAT DOES CHRIST WANT US TO DO?

THIS is a very searching question. It is a question which many are asking in these perplexing days. It is a little different from the question which Dr. Sheldon raised in his famous book, "In His Steps," for there the question was, "What would Jesus do were He in my place?" That was a presumptuous question, for no one has a right to say what Jesus would do, were He here, at any particular time or before any perplexing problem. It is permissible, on the other hand, to ask one's self at any time, "What would Jesus have me do?" But even in this case one would, in the last analysis, have to answer the question for himself. One mistake we ministers often make is to try and be the conscience for those who look to us for guidance. Yet, in a broad sense, it is perfectly legitimate to indicate, with Christ's words before us what He would have us all

do in these trying times. Let us then, recalling His life, death and teachings, ask ourselves what He would have us do.

Christ would, first of all, have us keep very close to Him in these days. We should not act hastily, we should not judge too quickly, we should not speak immoderately, but live so closely to Him that we may become absolutely imbued with His Spirit, should know His will, yes, even hear from Him just what we should think, say and do. If there ever was a time when the Christian should possess his soul in patience and live hourly in most intimate companionship with his Lord it is just now. All things are in confusion and chaos. Old things are passing away, many things are becoming new. During this chaos of civilization the world is passing over into a new order. The world will never be the same after this war. He who speaks out of his own heart may fall into great error. Surely Jesus would have us seek His will in every word we speak. He would have us invite Him into our hearts as our monitor and guide.

Surely Jesus would have us look out upon the world through His eyes and take His attitude toward all men. And His mind toward men is not hard to know. He walked before

the world three years, and His picture is very plainly drawn in the gospels. Look and see; He thought of all men, bad men as well as good, as His brothers. Roman and Greeks, Jews and Gentiles, friends and enemies, were His brothers. None of them did He wish to harm, all of them He wished to save. In several recorded instances He refused to yield to the popular clamour to destroy His enemies. He said He came to save them. In the light of this surely He would not have us destroy our enemies, but yearn to save them. This means, or else it is all a farce, that He would have us strive, *not* to destroy Germans, Mexicans, Englishmen, Japanese, Austrians or any others, but try to *save* them. Is this our present thought toward Germans? Surely His words apply to nations as well as men. Is this the thought of our nation at just this moment? He surely would have us as individuals think only of *saving* all men, as a nation think only of saving all nations.

What would Jesus have us do? He always loved His enemies and forgave them. He taught this explicitly as a law of life for all people and all peoples. His last act, an act when men were killing Him, was to forgive His enemies. One of His first disciples, Stephen,

did the same thing. Are we breathing thoughts of forgiveness toward our enemies? Are we trying to face our national enemies with thoughts of forgiveness? In one of the morning papers we are urged to go to war with Germany and help destroy her. In one of our evening papers is an editorial and a cartoon trying to stir our hatred toward Japan. Are these the thoughts Jesus would have us think toward the nations? What would Jesus have us do? The life of Jesus was one of *reconciliation.* He lived to reconcile men to God and to each other. He died for that same holy purpose. His Gospel was a gospel of reconciliation, "First be reconciled to thy brother." St. Paul found only that meaning in His words, His life, and His death: "And hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation.*" Is our chief aim in life the reconciliation of our enemies with ourselves, of men with each other? Is our nation at this time thinking chiefly of the God-given opportunity of reconciling the hating nations of Europe with each other, or is the nation chiefly concerned with seizing the opportunities for self-enrichment the war offers, and making its own self secure? Was Henry Ford a fool or a Christian when he started for Europe to see

if he could begin his process of reconciliation? We met a great-hearted soul to-day who is just starting for Europe, paying his own expenses, to see if he could begin reconciling some Germans and Englishmen who used to be beautiful friends. Is he a fool or a Christian? Is he doing what Jesus would have us all do?

What would Jesus have us do? He came into a world where everything was based on force. He spoke against force as a human instrument again and again, and told men to supplant it by love. He practised this teaching all His days. To be sure it ended disastrously for Himself; but it released a power that has transformed billions of lives. Can any one read His words and follow His life and death and not say that one thing He would have us do is to infuse love into all the relationships of men, base civilization upon it, and practise it in our own life? "It is impracticable," even many who bear the name of Christians, are saying. Yes, Wu Ting Fang said this, when in our country, and advised us to take Confucianism as a religion. Are you sure it is impracticable? Europe has tried force for 2,000 years, and what a spectacle the result is! A well-known preacher said, not long ago, that if all the lunatics in all the

asylums of Europe had been in the cabinets of Europe, they could not have dragged Europe into a worse hell than that in which her cabinets have landed her. Does it look as if the world's doctrine of *force* is very practicable? Suppose we should do as Jesus would have us do, and try *love* for a while, could it possibly be more impracticable than force has been? It certainly could not land the world in any worse hell than force has made, for there is none.

What would Jesus have us do? He would have us devote our life to the ideals He has given us, and without *compromise*. There is no compromise in His life. He had an ideal of action and He adhered to it. Here again it ended disastrously to Himself, but it gave the world the only ideal worthy the name that it has had for two thousand years. Everywhere about us to-day *compromise* is being urged. We are being told Christ's ideal was all right for the twelve to whom He gave it, and is all right for the millennium which is far off, but we must *accommodate* it to our times. Societies are even being formed, based on this principle of compromise and accommodation. The ideal must be attenuated to weak human nature, to the world as we find it. We heard

this urged by a Christian minister the other day. He used the dignified phrase that the Christian must "stop chewing the olive branch and chew brass tacks." The "New York Evening Post" for April 26 reports that when a resolution was offered in the Chamber of Commerce, on the day before, to indicate a willingness to meet representatives of other governments in a convention to promote the future peace of the world, one of its members, in criticizing the resolution, said that "the millennium was a long way off, and that it would be enough to forward preparations for national defence without setting out to do away with war." Needless to say the preparedness resolution was passed and the other "referred back to the committee." It is this Chamber of Commerce gospel many ministers are advocating to-day, as against the Christian Gospel contained in the spurned resolution. With compromise of the ideal Christ had nothing to do. Surely in this time of compromise Christ would have the Christian stand for the ideal without flinching. Happy they who have strength to do it. It is they, not the accommodators, who shall stand with the immortals.

Once more: What would Jesus have us do?

He would have us devote our lives not to care for them, not to protecting them, not to defending them, but to high service of all mankind in His name, and to allegiance to His kingdom. There are many to-day thinking first of self-preservation. There are many to-day who put allegiance to their country or race above allegiance to humanity, which is His kingdom. But Christ took no thought of self. He never worried about defending Himself. His chief allegiance was not to Jerusalem nor to the Jewish race. His only thought was the service of His brothers. His chief allegiance was to humanity. Above all nations was the kingdom. Surely He would have us follow Him in a self-forgetful service. Surely He would have us love His kingdom first. What an opportunity to all *brave* souls to do what Christ would have us do!

XXVI

JESUS' TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP

IT is with a profound sense of relief that one sometimes turns from the tests of Christian faith which have been set up by the churches to the test which Jesus Himself imposed upon those who would enter the kingdom. We recently had occasion to examine the creed of a famous Church, to which creed, until recently, every one joining that Church was supposed to subscribe. It is really a treatise on systematic theology—an able one, too, but quite as far from the words of Jesus as one could conveniently go. Neither was it greatly concerned with the facts of Christ. It was concerned with interpretation of those facts. But when one turns from the creeds and confessions to the Gospels he finds himself in quite another atmosphere. Here is all simplicity, although all is greatness. Again and again Christ affirms the test of discipleship. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples—that ye have love one toward

another." In the world, he is greatest who rules and lords it over others and gets the most for himself. But in Christ's kingdom he is greatest who serves, he is chief who lives in lowly ministry. The meek, lowly, merciful, pure man is blessed and enters His kingdom. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect" is Jesus' ideal for the soul. The Father in heaven who loves, comforts, forgives and helps men realizes this perfection is His gospel, His good news. It is all so simple that a child can grasp it, although it is as great as suns and seas and stars. And when he would sum it all up and give illustration, He turns to a little child. There is no more significant fact in all history. The greatest religion the world has known, the religion many of us think absolute and final, is focussed in a little child on a man's knee. Jesus sets the child on His knee, and as He strokes its hair says, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." To become a Christian is to become as a little child!

What did Jesus mean? Of course, He meant that one had got to rid himself of all

sham, hypocrisy, pride, self-conceit, self-righteousness, self-consciousness, and become before God as a little child. A child is guileless, innocent, single-minded, transparent as glass. Whatever else children may be, they are not hypocrites; they do not lead double lives; they do not pose. A child is not self-conscious, is never puffed up, conceited, proud, overestimating himself, thinking himself great. This is just what men are doing all the time. Jesus says the first step into His kingdom is to get rid of all this self-esteem, this vanity, this pride, this complexity of motive, this duplicity, and become in God's eyes again as a little, guileless, teachable child.

Jesus must also have been thinking of the faith element in childhood, for faith was the fundamental article of His philosophy of life. And faith in his parents, in men and women everywhere, in the general goodness of the world, is the foundation of the child's life. This faith is so absolute that it is unconscious, as most great truths are. Jesus says that this simple, childlike faith in the heavenly Father —absolute trust in His providence, so that one can go out and do His work in the world as the little child does his work and play, believing that the Father will feed one as the child knows

his parents will feed him—this is the first great article of faith in the Christian's creed. To the child the world is good, and moves out into goodness. It is not an easy faith to keep, especially in these days. But Jesus kept it, and those who can keep it are the happy folk. Beware the day when, through disillusionment, one becomes blasé, sceptical of life's goodness, and old.

One of the most outstanding traits of the child is his zest for living, the eagerness with which he greets the day. New every morning is the world, and brighter and fresher than it was yesterday. Life is an alluring thing. Each day holds out more promise than any day that has ever been. There is no living in the past, no thought that life has yielded its best. The child's golden age is never behind it; it is always in to-morrow. Jesus knew that this general attitude toward life was absolutely necessary to any rich, full, advancing life. That it was not only the only joy that lasted, but was the one thing that kept the world young and sweet. Such men are the salt of the earth, the light of the world. What a joy it was to know Munger, Smiley, Collyer, Cuyler, Hale—men who kept this childlike zest of living to the end; men who at seventy and eighty

were as interested in the moving world and taking as much part in it as those of thirty and forty!

There are other traits of childhood one might mention which were undoubtedly in Christ's mind at this time. The child is eager to learn, full of curiosity, which, kept through later life, becomes eagerness for knowledge. The child is always creating something. Did one ever know a child who was not building castles with his blocks, whole towns and walled cities when on the beach, tunnels and railroads out of scraps of wood and iron? This creative instinct persists in some men, and they are the world's benefactors. Most of us lose it, and live half-lives.

But one thing Jesus must surely have been thinking about when He put the little child upon His knee and said, " Here is the real Christian." The child believes in brotherhood—real brotherhood. He does not talk it, as we do, bue he lives it, as we do not. There is no trace of race prejudice in the child. He plays with Italian and Japanese children, with rich and poor, dirty and clean, and they are all one to him. Race prejudice, class distinctions, national animosities are *all educated* into the child. It is the parents who make of the

children haters of their brothers. If all the parents could be killed off and the children left to grow up uninstructed by them, there would probably not be a vestige of ill feeling left between Germans and French, Japanese and Americans. A great Frenchman said to us on the eve of the European war: "This hatred between Germans and French is all a cultivated, artificial, imparted thing. I have watched German and French children playing together in Alsace on the border line, and they were all unconscious of any hatreds whatever. But as soon as they are old enough to understand anything, the governments and the parents of both nations begin systematic endeavour to instil hatred of their neighbours in their breasts." Neither race nor nationality had any interest for Jesus. He knew they were artificial things and provocative of strife. He wanted His disciples to rise above all these things into the kingdom, into the brotherhood of all aliens, and it is just there that the child lives.

XXVII

SOME RAYS OF HOPE

THERE is no doubt but that a great despondency rests upon most people who are doing any thinking in these days, or who have any heart, or who are concerned over the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. The Dark Ages could not have been any darker than are ours. We cannot blame any one for feeling discouraged, neither have we any of those words of shallow optimism which come from certain preachers and editors who lack both vision and capacity to enter into the sorrows of the world. Who can help feeling despondent who really pauses and thinks: Europe committing physical, political and moral suicide; hatreds drowning out all true religious sentiment and instinct; all the money both of to-day and the future in Europe being taken from religion, education and reform to be used in human slaughter; all the papers from England deploring lack of interest in religion; in our own land the con-

tagion of war and militarism from Europe possessing us, so that we have ministers of the Lord of love, forgiveness, good-will, brotherhood, screaming as loud as have our European brothers for the last ten years for arms and war and revenge; along with this the hunger and crying of a million starving children of Europe, whose sufferings apparently have no deterrent effect upon the war makers and war lovers of the nations.

But in the midst of all this darkness now and then a ray of light shines, a sign of hope, a little triumph of Christianity that makes one feel that darkness is not over the face of the world forever, and that those who stand for righteousness, justice and good-will still have some grounds for faith. There are two or three of these rays of hope, which are just now shining and which should greatly cheer us who are striving for the kingdom.

The first of these is the triumph of the prison reform movement. For that is what the reinstatement of Thomas Mott Osborne as warden of Sing Sing really means. The dastardly attack upon Mr. Osborne by the old prison ring, the group of those who saw graft, fat contracts and big commissions passing from their hands, and by the other group of those

who believe in the old, vindictive eye-for-eye-tooth-for-tooth punishment of criminals, was not chiefly or solely an attack upon Mr. Osborne, but upon the whole idea of Christian treatment of criminals. Indeed, sooner or later, all these attempts to check and hinder the new ideals of redemption as over against revenge, whether it be in application to individual or national relationships, are blows at the introduction of Christ methods into human affairs. There is nothing that is ever so much resisted, nothing that so angers the stand-pat, respectable portion of society so much, as the endeavour to apply the teachings and ideals of Christ to a new realm of life, a new sphere of human activity. Progress largely consists in adding the triumph of these ideals to one sphere of life, and then going on to fight for them in another.

The fundamental philosophy of the prison system has been threefold: first, that the criminal should get back what he gave, punishment to fit the crime; secondly, that punishment should be of such a nature as should deter others from crime; thirdly, that society should be protected from the criminal. The first principle is, of course, utterly barbarous, that of revenge; the second has never worked, for

there is not the slightest indication that the severe punishment of one man ever kept other men from criminal acts; and the third principle has, instead of protecting society, been its worst menace, for our prisons have invariably succeeded in sending out their inmates more hostile to society than when they entered.

Now along comes a group of people, such leaders as Samuel Barrows, Thomas Mott Osborne, George W. Kirchwey, Madeleine Z. Doty and John Galsworthy, who demand nothing more nor less than that the Christian principles be applied to the treatment of prisoners. What these principles are can be determined by one glance at the Gospels. Jesus' every word expresses them; in every contact with sinful people He expressed them, namely: that the duty of society to the criminal was to redeem him, and that the only way to protect society was to make the evil people over into good members of it. The first principle has come to be recognized as the essence of religion; the second as good common sense and the only practical method of protecting society. Mr. Osborne started in to apply these methods at Sing Sing with a thoroughness never before exemplified, although experiments had been begun in many quarters. Mr. Os-

borne's success was wonderful. It was too great. It stirred the resentment of the old crowd who had lived on the prisons; it awoke the antagonism of the politicians, it frightened those who always resist the application of Christianity to a new sphere of life. But the new ideals have triumphed. Mr. Osborne was merely the representative of a great cause. It was the cause which was on trial and the cause has won. More widely than ever the redemptive idea will be applied, and Mr. Osborne's contention that prisons are churches, hospitals and schools, not charnel houses, and that the best way to protect society is to send out men with good-will toward it, will be maintained.

Another ray of hope is the stand the President has taken on the Mexican situation and that so many of the American people stood so splendidly behind him. Mr. Wilson has taken the same attitude toward Mexico that Mr. Osborne has taken toward Sing Sing, the Christian attitude, that the thing to do to the criminal is not to lambaste him, not to starve him, not to kill him, not to punish him simply for the sake of punishing him, but to redeem him and win his good-will. Certain Mexicans —of the irresponsible part of the population —have made raids into this country. A few

Americans have lost their lives in Mexico. Some American property has been unprotected. It has been difficult to persuade Mr. Carranza to work in concert with the American army to capture the brigands and restore order. As a result of all this, the exploiters, the yellow journals, the militarists and the war-lovers about the country have been working night and day to get us to go to war against Mexico, and have spared no toil and no lies to bring about invasion.

Such invasion would, of course, work for Mexico just what the old Sing Sing did for its inmates—harden the heart, arouse lasting and bitter hatred, fasten the resolve upon Mexico to get even with us at the first opportunity, and help no one but the grafters back of the invasion. Mr. Wilson has seen this in regard to Mexico just as Mr. Osborne did for Sing Sing and has come out splendidly for the Christian procedure just at a time when it looked as though nothing in the world would hold us back from war. His superb words have been the greatest encouragement of anything in these dark days. The fact, too, that so many ministers—one would naturally suppose that all ministers would take the Christian point of view, but they have not, for some have

been silent, and some have even upheld the war crowd—teachers, business men and workingmen immediately wrote and wired the President to remain firm in his Christian course was a great encouragement in these days, when the war fever holds the whole world in its grasp. The "New York Evening Sun" of June 29, on the day the freed American prisoners reached the border, said: "Hundreds of telegrams were delivered to the White House this morning urging the President to take all possible steps for peace with Mexico. Many of the telegrams suggested that the United States ought to be willing to arbitrate the questions in dispute. White House officials seemed to regard the great bulk of telegrams as a pretty marked indication of the feeling of the country." Several delegations went from mass meetings held in New York to see the President and hundreds of the leading clergymen of the nation wrote Mr. Wilson. We hear that the President was very grateful for all this backing, and that it has greatly encouraged him in the determination to do the Christian thing in Mexico instead of the old military, futile thing. What a throb of hope went through the heart of the Christians of the country when Mr. Wilson uttered those

great words before the New York Press Club at one of its recent meetings! What an encouragement to all believers in the new way and in the application of Christianity to international affairs are the equally great words recently uttered at Detroit:

"I was trying to expound in another place the other day the long way and the short way to get together. The long way is to fight. I have heard some gentlemen say that they want to help Mexico, and the way they propose to help her is to overwhelm her with force. That is the long way to help Mexico, as well as the wrong way. Because after the fighting you have a nation full of justified suspicions and animated by well-founded hostility and hatred. And then will you help them? Then will you establish cordial business relationships with them? Then will you go on as neighbours and establish their confidence? On the contrary, you will have shut every door as if it were of steel against you. What makes Mexico suspicious of us is that she does not believe as yet that we want to serve her. She believes we want to possess her. And she has justification for the belief in the way in which some of our fellow-citizens have tried to exploit her privileges and possessions. For my

part, I will not serve the ambitions of those gentlemen, but I will try to serve all America, so far as intercourse with Mexico is concerned, by trying to serve Mexico herself."

That is real Christianity! There is no more justification for a nation living to itself than for an individual, and the individual who lives for himself is not a Christian, whatever else he is! How these words stand out amid the welter of the world, amid the sordid voices of selfish kings. How infinitely above such a sentence as "The first duty of a nation is to protect the lives of its citizens" stands this word of Mr. Wilson, "I will try to serve all America . . . by trying to serve Mexico herself."

Printed in the United States of America

JAMES H. SNOWDEN, D.D.

The Psychology of Religion

8vo, cloth, net $1.50.

Psychology is one of the most rapidly advancing of modern sciences, and Dr. Snowden's book will find a ready welcome. While especially adapted for the use of ministers and teachers, it is not in any sense an ultra-academic work. This is evidenced by the fact that the material forming it has been delivered not only as a successful Summer School course, but in the form of popular lectures, open to the general public.

WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON, Ph.D., D.D.

Professor of Greek and New Testament Literature in Lincoln University, Pa.

The Christian Faith under Modern Searchlight

The L. P. Stone Lectures, Princeton. Introduction by Francis L. Patton, D.D. Cloth, net $1.25.

The faith which is to survive must not only be a traditional but an intelligent faith which has its roots in reason and experience and its blossom and fruit in character and good works. To this end, the author examines the fundamentals of the Christian belief in the light of to-day and reaches the conclusion that every advance in knowledge establishes its sovereign claim to be from heaven and not from men.

ANDREW W. ARCHIBALD, D.D.

Author of "The Bible Verified," "The Trend of the Centuries," etc.

The Modern Man Facing the Old Problems

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

A thoughtful, ably-conducted study in which those problems of human life, experience and destiny, which, in one form or another, seem recurrent in every age, are examined from what may be called a Biblical viewpoint. That is to say, the author by its illuminating rays, endeavors to find elucidation and solution for the difficulties, which in more or less degree, perplex believer and unbeliever alike.

NOLAN RICE BEST *Editor of "The Continent"*

Applied Religion for Everyman

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

Nolan Rice Best has earned a well-deserved reputation in the religious press of America, as a writer of virile, trenchantly-phrased editorials. The selection here brought together represent his best efforts, and contains an experienced editor's suggestions for the ever-recurrent problems confronting Church members as a body, and as individual Christians. Mr. Best wields a facile pen, and a sudden gleam of beauty, a difficult thought set in a perfect phrase, or an old idea invested with new meaning and grace, meets one at every turn of the page."—*The Record Herald.*

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER

The Kingdom in History and Prophecy

Introduction by C. I. Scofield. 12mo, cloth, net 75c.

"Anything that comes from the pen of this writer and Bible teacher may be accepted as thoroughly sound and intelligent in its presentation of truth. This is a study of the historical and prophetic aspects of the kingdom of God in their relations to the present age and that which is shortly to come."—*Christian Worker's Magazine.*

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT

The Complete Testimony

The Testimony of the Early Fathers, Proving the Universal Observance of Sunday in the First Centuries. 12mo, paper, net 20c.

The author of "Seventh Day Adventism" gives in concise, connected form the testimonies of all the early Christian Fathers from the Apostles down to A. D. 400. Invaluable to pastor and people—there is no other booklet like it.

C. F. WIMBERLY, B.A.

Behold the Morning!

The Imminent and Premillennial Coming of Jesus Christ. 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

R A. Torrey says: "I am sure the book will interest a great many in the subject, who have not been interested in the ordinary discussions of the subject. The book is one of the three books that I would recommend to any one who wishes to take up a study of the subject."

HENRY T. SELL, D.D.

Bible Studies in Vital Questions

12mo, cloth, net 60c; paper, net 35c.

The new volume of Sell's Bible Studies is prepared for adult Bible and pastors' classes and for use in schools, colleges and private study. It deals, in a plain, concise and constructive way, with the vital questions of the Christian faith about the Bible, God, Man and the Church. I. Vital Questions About the Bible. II. Vital Questions About God. III. Vital Questions About Man. IV. Vital Questions About the Church.

EDWARD LEIGH PELL

Author of "Pell's Notes on the Sunday School Lesson"

Our Troublesome Religious Questions

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

A frank, earnest inquiry into, and discussion of, the problems of religious creed and conduct which vex and perplex believer and unbeliever alike. The author displays a marked ability to take up these questions and examine them with sagacity, impartiality and an optimistic, triumphant faith.

J. STUART HOLDEN, M.A. *Author of "The Life of Fuller Purpose," "The Price of Power," etc.*

The Confidence of Faith

12mo, cloth, net 75c.

A choice body of sermonic material, the general trend and theme of which is the necessity that has arisen in these later days, for a steady, deeply-rooted confidence in things that are eternal. The troublous days through which the world is now passing, has brought perplexity and sorrow to many loving hearts. For all such, as well as for believers everywhere, Mr. Holden's new book breathes a message of solace and enheartenment.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D. *Wycliffe College Toronto, Canada*

Grace and Power

Some Aspects of the Spiritual Life. Cloth, net $1.00.

"A thoughtful, well written body of devotional writing. The ground covered is that of the possibilities of the Christian life, of the provision made for their realization, and of the protective grace flung around the believer, enabling one to hold fast to his ideals."—*Christian Work.*

AUGUSTA ALBERTSON

Through Gates of Pearl

A Vision of the Heaven Life. Cloth, net $1.00.

"A fountain of fresh spiritual strength. It is a book big with promise, large with the foundation of a great hope; it appeals to the reason as well as to the heart, and it interprets Scripture in a satisfying way accomplished by few books written by lay-writers."—*Book News.*

J. M. CAMPBELL, D.D. *Author of "Grow Old Along with Me" "The Heart of the Gospel," etc.*

Prayer in Its Present-Day Aspects

12mo, cloth, net 75c.

Here is a book written to meet a situation unparalled in history, to restate certain aspects of an eternal truth in the light of the conditions and demands of these perilous times. Prayer as related to the conception of God, the conception of man, bodily healing, spiritual force, natural phenomena and war, are some of the issues dealt with by Dr. Campbell. A timely and valuable treatise on the highest function of the soul.

JAMES G. K. McCLURE, D.D.

Intercessory Prayer

A Mighty Means of Usefulness

New Edition. 12mo, cloth, net 50c.

A new edition of this helpful work of glowing faith which shows the power and potency of prayer, furnishing examples of Christian experience and convictions. "Above all, it is true, practical, useful and inspiring."—*Christian Work.*

J. H. JOWETT, D.D. — *Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York*

The Whole Armour of God

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

"This popular preacher is, not only by his own people, but also by large numbers of others, considered the very greatest preacher. He is possessed of a rare and perhaps unequalled combination of the very qualities which captivate. His thoughts are always expressed in the simplest possible diction, so that their crystalline clearness makes them at once apprehended."—*Christian Evangelist.*

EDGAR DE WITT JONES — *Author of "The Inner Circle"*

The Wisdom of God's Fools

And Other Sermons. 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

A volume of discourses, displaying the same facility for the right word and fitting phrase which marked the author's previous work. Mr. Jones preaches sermons that *read* well—a not at all common quality. He is a thinker too; and brings to his thinking a lucidity and attractiveness which make his presentation of great truths an artistic, as well as an inspiring achievement. A note of deep spirituality is everywhere manifest.

FREDERICK F. SHANNON — *Pastor of the Reformed-Church-on-the-Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.*

The Enchanted Universe

And Other Sermons. 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

Mr. Shannon's reputation as an eloquent and forceful preacher is still further enhanced by his new volume of sermons. The fervid, glowing character of the popular Brooklyn pastor's appeals, make the reading of his latest book, not only an inspiring, but a fascinating exercise.

GEORGE W. TRUETT, D.D. — *Pastor First Baptist Church, Dallas, Tex.*

We Would See Jesus and Other Sermons

Compiled and edited by J. B. Cranfill. Net $1.00.

"One of the greatest—many would say the greatest—of all the world's preachers to-day. It ranks high among the extant books of sermons, past and present, and deserves a place in millions of homes."—*Biblical Recorder.*

BISHOP CHARLES EDWARD CHENEY

A Neglected Power

And Other Sermons. 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"Thoroughly evangelical in spirit, refreshing in Biblical truth and abounding in helpful ministrations for every day life."—*Evangelical Messenger.*

JAMES L. GORDON, D.D.

All's Love Yet All's Law

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

"Discloses the secret of Dr. Gordon's eloquence—fresh, and intimate presentations of truth which always keep close to reality. Dr. Gordon also seems to have the world's literature at his command. A few of the titles will give an idea of the scope of his preaching. 'The Law of Truth: The Science of Universal Relationships'; 'The Law of Inspiration: The Vitalizing Power of Truth'; 'The Law of Vibration'; 'The Law of Beauty: The Spiritualizing Power of Thought'; The Soul's Guarantee of Immortality."—*Christian Work.*

BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL *Cole Lectures*

Personal Christianity

Instruments and Ends in the Kingdom of God.

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

The latest volume of the famous "Cole Lectures" delivered at Vanderbilt University. The subjects are: I. The Personal in Christianity. II. The Instrumental in Christianity. III. The Mastery of World-Views. IV. The Invigoration of Morality. V. The Control of Social Advance. VI. "Every Kindred, and People, and Tongue."

NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, D.D.

Lectures and Orations by Henry Ward Beecher

Collected by Newell Dwight Hillis. 12mo, net $1.20.

It is fitting that one who is noted for the grace, finish and eloquence of his own addresses should choose those of his predecessor which he deems worthy to be preserved in a bound volume as the most desirable, the most characteristic and the most dynamic utterances of America's greatest pulpit orator.

W. L. WATKINSON, D. D.

The Moral Paradoxes of St. Paul

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"These sermons are marked, even to greater degree than is usual with their talented preacher, by clearness, force and illustrative aptness. He penetrates unerringly to the heart of Paul's paradoxical settings forth of great truths, and illumines them with pointed comment and telling illustration. The sermons while thoroughly practical are garbed in striking and eloquent sentences, terse, nervous, attention-compelling."—*Christian World.*

LEN G. BROUGHTON, D.D.

The Prodigal and Others

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"The discourses are vital, bright, interesting and helpful. It makes a preacher feel like preaching once more on this exhaustless parable, and will prove helpful to all young people —and older ones, too. Dr. Broughton does not hesitate to make his utterances striking and entertaining by the introduction of numerous appropriate and homely stories and illustrations. He reaches the heart."—*Review and Expositor.*

PROF. HUGH BLACK

The New World

16mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"The old order changeth, bringing in the new." To a review of our changing world—religious, scientific, social—Hugh Black brings that interpretative skill and keen insight which distinguishes all his writings and thinking. Especially does he face the prohlem of the present-day unsettlement and unrest in religious beliefs with sanity and courage, furnishing in this, as in other aspects of his enquiry, a new viewpoint and clarified outlook.

S. D. GORDON

Quiet Talks on John's Gospel

As Presented in the Gospel of John. Cloth, net 75c.

Mr. Gordon halts his reader here and there, at some precious text, some outstanding instance of God's tenderness, much as a traveller lingers for refreshment at a wayside spring, and bids us hearken as God's wooing note is heard pleading for consecrated service. An enheartening book, and a restful. A book of the winning Voice, of outstretched Hands.

ROBERT F. HORTON, D.D.

The Springs of Joy and Other Addresses

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"Scholarly, reverent, penetrating, human. The product of a mature mind and of a genuine and sustained religious experience. The message of a thinker and a saint, which will be found to be very helpful."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

BISHOP WALTER R. LAMBUTH

Winning the World for Christ

A Study of Dynamics. Cole Lectures for 1915. 12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

This Lecture-Course is a spirited contribution to the dynamics of Missions. It presents a study of the sources of inspiration and power in the lives of missionaries, native and foreign, who with supreme abandon gave themselves utterly to the work to which they were called.

FREDERICK F. SHANNON, D.D.

The New Personality and Other Sermons

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

Mr. Shannon, pastor of the Reformed Church on the Heights, Brooklyn, is possessed of lofty ideals, is purposeful, more than ordinarily eloquent and has the undoubted gifts of felicitous and epigrammatic expression. This new volume by the popular preacher is a contribution of distinct value to current sermonic literature.

JY
1952
L85

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

3 1205 02547 8296
2/02
WB

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

AA 000 790 720 7